

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7675. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American Legion," approved September 16, 1919, so as to extend membership eligibility therein to certain American citizens, honorably discharged from the active military or naval forces of the United States, or of some country allied with the United States during World War No. 2; without amendment (Rept. No. 2534). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 550. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Civil Service to investigate various activities in the departments and agencies of the Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 2535). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 7695. A bill to aid in preventing inflation, to stabilize the rents of real property, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XLII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 1334. An act for the relief of Anthony Famiglietti; without amendment (Rept. No. 2537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. S. 2195. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Charles E. Salmons; with amendment (Rept. No. 2538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. S. 2593. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the fire which destroyed the administration building, Naval Operating Base, Norfolk, Va., on January 26, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 2539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 2363. An act for the relief of Percy Ray Greer, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 2540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5409. A bill for the relief of Gwendolyn Anne Olhava and Anthony L. Olhava; with amendment (Rept. No. 2541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6749. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Schakett; with amendment (Rept. No. 2542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7465. A bill for the relief of the postmaster at Nome, Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 2543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7012. A bill for the relief of Litchfield Bros., Aurora, N. C.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7247. A bill for the relief of Silas Frankel and Louis Mr. Koren; with amendment (Rept. No. 2545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6771. A bill for the relief of Roy Delavergne;

with amendment (Rept. No. 2546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6863. A bill for the relief of Thomas W. Dowd; with amendment (Rept. No. 2547). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6924. A bill for the relief of Joseph F. Gordon; with amendment (Rept. No. 2548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7035. A bill for the relief of Mr. Garland Galley, of Baldwin, Ga., and Mrs. Clara Mae Galley, of Baldwin, Ga.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2549). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7288. A bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers; without amendment (Rept. 2550). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7290. A bill for the relief of Beatriz Milan Vda. de Vazquez; without amendment (Rept. No. 2551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RUSSELL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7333. A bill for the relief of Arkansas Gazette, Hope Star, the Hope Journal, Arkansas Democrat Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7569. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Nagel; without amendment (Rept. No. 2553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7586. A bill for the relief of Victoria Jessie Lodge Skin, now Standing Bear; without amendment (Rept. No. 2554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7587. A bill for the relief of Etta A. Thompson, Marion E. Graham, Irene Morgan, and Alice K. Weber; without amendment (Rept. No. 2555). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7649. A bill for the relief of Ralph B. Randall, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Visalia, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2556). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7650. A bill for the relief of Col. Leo A. Luttringer, United States property and disbursing officer for Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 2557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7651. A bill for the relief of William F. Perkins, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Pinal County, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7652. A bill for the relief of Warren M. Engstrand, grant supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Bakersfield, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7653. A bill for the relief of Ensign Donald L. Grunsky; without amendment (Rept. 2560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6366. A bill for the relief of Alex Lawson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5175. A bill for the relief of Edward Workman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5274. A bill for the relief of Michael Leo Fitzpatrick; with amendment (Rept. No. 2563). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5649. A bill for the relief of Alice Comas, Robert Comas, and Frances Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 2564). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5812. A bill for the relief of William E. Averitt and United States Casualty Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6285. A bill for the relief of Clarence A. Houser and his wife, Mrs. Jewel Houser; with amendment (Rept. No. 2566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5154. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse the legal guardian of Elmer White, deceased, for personal injuries which resulted in the death of Elmer White by being struck by a truck owned by the Civilian Conservation Corps; with amendment (Rept. No. 2567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 7708. A bill to amend the act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interest of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 7709. A bill to amend section 347 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to extend for a period of 2 years the time within which petitions for naturalization filed prior to the effective date of that act may be heard; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURGIN:

H. R. 7710. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, with respect to liability for training and service of any individual convicted of a crime not a felony at common law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1942

Gen. George L. Carpenter, of London, England, international leader of the Salvation Army, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, who hath made the earth by Thy power, who hath established the world by Thy wisdom, we approach Thee with reverence and thanksgiving. We thank Thee, though Thou art high and lifted up, yet hast Thou respect unto the lowly. Thou art mindful of our estate and art concerned with the well-being of all Thy creation.

Humbly we ask that health and safety, and the enrichment of Thy presence, may be granted to His Excellency, the President, in all the exacting demands of his exalted office.

Be gracious to the brave men who, in sacrificial devotion, are serving the Nation's cause in many lands.

In the midst of a world of change and anxiety we pray that in all our hearts shall be quietness and confidence, and

increasingly an awareness of Thyself—the Unchanging One.

In a period when men everywhere are groping as in the dark, grant that we shall know Thee as our light and our unerring guide. Thou art the Light of the World.

Wilt Thou give to Thy servants here assembled the sure guidance of Thy wisdom, also to all charged with like responsibility in the affairs of this vast Republic, so that by the enactment and observance of just laws the bow of the Nation shall abide in strength, and its peoples be preserved in unity and godly fear.

In the name of Christ, our Redeemer, we present these our petitions.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 13, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 10, 1942:

S. 2627. An act to amend the act approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 864), entitled "An act increasing the number of naval aviators in the line of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes";

S. 2677. An act to authorize an exchange of land at Mechanicsburg, Pa., between Edger Eberly and the United States;

S. 2678. An act to amend the act approved March 2, 1933, by suspending the provisions relative to a Navy ration in kind, and for other purposes;

S. 2717. An act for the relief of Charles H. Koch; and

S. 2731. An act to suspend until June 30, 1945, the running of the statute of limitations applicable to violations of the anti-trust laws.

On October 13, 1942:

S. 97. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Joy Montgomery, a minor;

S. 305. An act for the relief of Mrs. Felix Belanger;

S. 317. An act for the relief of Monroe Short;

S. 1220. An act for the relief of G. C. Barco and W. G. Knowles;

S. 2191. An act for the relief of Clara Wrobliski;

S. 2279. An act for the relief of O. R. Maxfield;

S. 2420. An act for the relief of Isabelle Fuller;

S. 2461. An act for the relief of Minnie C. Sanders;

S. 2676. An act to provide for medical care and funeral expenses for certain members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and

S. 2682. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to exchange certain lands of the United States located within the Fort De Russy Military Reservation, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, for certain land at Barbers Point, Oahu, owned by the Territory of Hawaii.

On October 14, 1942:

S. 2190. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marilla C. Gray;

S. 2248. An act to amend the law relating to the care and custody of insane residents of Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 2570. An act to provide for the sale by the Superintendent of Documents of copies of certain historical and naval documents printed by the Government Printing Office;

S. 2679. An act to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey, incident to secret or confidential orders, and for other purposes; and

S. 2685. An act to provide that promotions to higher grades of officers of the Army of the United States, or any components thereof, shall be deemed to have been accepted upon the dates of the orders announcing such promotions, and for other purposes.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3152) to suspend restrictions during the present war and for 1 year thereafter upon the service of certain officers of the Marine Corps in the Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5143) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1024. An act to amend an act to prevent pernicious political activities;

H. R. 7629. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to expedite the war effort by providing for releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7675. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American Legion," approved September 16, 1919, so as to extend membership eligibility therein to certain American citizens, honorably discharged from the active military or naval forces of the United States, or of some country allied with the United States during World War No. 2.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2442. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and a service lapel button;

S. 2775. An act to amend the act of March 5, 1942, relating to the planting of guayule and other rubber-bearing plants;

H. R. 3152. An act to suspend restrictions during the present war and for 1 year thereafter upon the service of certain officers of the Marine Corps in the Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.; and

H. R. 5143. An act to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1024. An act to amend an act to prevent pernicious political activities; and

H. R. 7675. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American Legion," approved September 16, 1919, so as to extend membership eligibility therein to certain American citizens, honorably dis-

charged from the active military or naval forces of the United States, or of some country allied with the United States during World War No. 2; to the Committee on the Judiciary

H. R. 7629. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, so as to expedite the war effort by providing for releasing officers and men for duty at sea and their replacement by women in the shore establishment of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES FILED DURING THE ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 13th instant,

The following reports of committees were filed on October 14, 1942:

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Patents:

S. 2794. A bill to provide for adjusting royalties for the use of inventions for the benefit of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1640).

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 7672. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1641).

#### PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Topeka, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of 202 citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of the so-called anti-poll-tax bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. P. 4465. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands in Minnesota; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1642).

By Mr. WILLIS, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. Res. 294. Resolution requesting interval reports from the Federal Rubber Administrator concerning rubber supplies and production (submitted by Mr. WILLIS on September 28, 1942); with an amendment (Rept. No. 1643).

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on October 14, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 174. An act for the relief of Lyle L. Bressler; and

S. 2203. An act for the relief of Bayard M. Atwood.

#### AGRICULTURAL LABOR SHORTAGES IN THE WESTERN STATES

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I have been authorized by the Military Affairs



Committee to report favorably Senate Resolution 299, providing for the appointment of a special committee of three Senators by the President of the Senate to investigate farm conditions in the West and providing for an appropriation of \$3,000. In accordance with the rule, I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be so referred.

#### LANDING AREAS UNDER JURISDICTION OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 306), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Appropriations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to investigate existing and proposed landing areas under the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the need and location of additional sites.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses, to employ clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, to administer oaths, to take testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words, and the expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 2850. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Robert A. Watson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2851. A bill to accord free entry to bona fide gifts from members of the armed forces of the United States on duty abroad; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2852. A bill to authorize the President to confer decorations and medals upon units of, or persons serving with, the military forces of cobelligerent nations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. BARKLEY introduced Senate bill 2853, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

#### STABILIZATION OF RENTS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to aid in preventing inflation, to stabilize rents of real property, and for other purposes. It is similar to the bill introduced in the House of Representatives which the Committee on Banking and Currency of that body has reported favorably. It proposes to amend the Price Control Act so as to include rents, not only in defense areas but elsewhere. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The bill (S. 2853) to aid in preventing inflation, to stabilize the rents of real property, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### JUDICIAL DISTRICTS IN FLORIDA—AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2778) dividing the State of Florida into two judicial districts, defining the territory embraced in each, and fixing the time of holding terms of court therein, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

#### NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. MALONEY submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 7672) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

At the proper place, insert the following new section:

"Sec. —. Any money which, under the provisions of section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act (Public 528, 77th Cong.), as amended (relating to the renegotiation of contracts), is retained by the United States or withheld by the United States from a contractor or subcontractor, and which would be or would have been payable to a contractor or subcontractor except for the renegotiation of a contract under such section, shall be returned to the Treasury and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. MALONEY also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7672, the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

#### INVESTIGATION OF RAILROAD FINANCING AND OTHER MATTERS

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution concerning the activities of the Interstate Commerce Committee to investigate railroad financing and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The resolution (S. Res. 304) was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, authorizing an investigation of railroad financing and certain other matters, as continued and amended, is hereby continued in full force and effect during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, and the Committee on Interstate Commerce is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during such sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods, the amounts heretofore authorized for said purposes.

#### ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CO-OPERATIVES IN THE SALE OF RADIO TIME

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish to submit a Senate resolution regarding a

dispute between the Cooperative League, U. S. A., and some of the radio broadcasting stations. Later, when the routine morning business shall have been concluded, if I can get recognition, I shall make a few remarks regarding the resolution. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The resolution (S. Res. 305) was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

Whereas the Cooperative League of the United States of America has reported in a resolution formally adopted at the thirteenth biennial congress of the league that the National Broadcasting Co. and the Columbia Broadcasting System had unfairly and unjustly discriminated against the league by denying the league the opportunity to purchase radio time; and

Whereas this report of the Cooperative League of the United States of America raises a very vital question as to the necessity for amendments to the Communications Act, 1934: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to obtain such facts as the Cooperative League of the United States of America, the broadcasting companies, the Federal Communications Commission, the Department of Justice, and other Government agencies and other groups or persons may have bearing on the accuracy of the charges of discrimination against cooperatives and others by the major broadcasting companies in the sale of their radio time; and on the question whether the Federal Communications Act, 1934, should be further amended to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to prevent such discrimination, or should be otherwise amended to deal with the problem of granting further authority to the said Commission by restricting or affecting the power of said broadcasting companies. The said committee or duly authorized subcommittee is authorized and directed to secure the assistance of other Government agencies in the investigation hereby authorized and to report to the Senate the facts ascertained in the course of the investigation and the recommendations therein.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production and impounding of books, papers, and documents, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, which shall not exceed \$1,000 in addition to the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

#### ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. HATCH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 307), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the authority of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys under Senate Resolution No. 245, Seventy-seventh Congress, to employ an assistant clerk is hereby continued until otherwise provided by law or resolution.

SECOND BIMONTHLY REPORT OF CHAIRMAN OF WAR PRODUCTION BOARD  
(S. DOC. NO. 274)

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document the second bimonthly report of the Chairman of the War Production Board dated October 11, 1942, under section 5 of the Murray-Patman Act, Public 603, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 11, 1942.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SHORTAGE OF FARM LABOR

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Mr. Arthur Krock, writing in the New York Times as of October 10, has presented an admirable picture of the crisis which now exists as a result of the shortage of farm labor. America, in this World War, must be not only an arsenal for democracy, but must be the bread basket for democracy.

As Mr. Krock so correctly points out, Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey's agency determines who is to be inducted into the Army, and when the War Manpower Commission, under Paul V. McNutt, is considering the distribution of manpower. It is essential that these two agencies work out a satisfactory solution to this problem. Otherwise the continued shortage of farm labor will result in a situation which will not only bankrupt millions of farmers in America, but will prevent the production of sufficient food, so essential to the winning of the war.

On the one hand, it is essential that skilled farm hands and operators be deferred on the same basis with skilled industrial workers. I do not mean, of course, that all farm workers should be deferred but that the same standards as to being essential be applied to farm workers that is now being applied to industrial workers. On the other hand, there must be some means to prevent the enticement of farm labor from the farms by the high wages paid by the Government and in war industry operations.

It would be the height of folly to continue to draft for military service experienced farm hands and then later to draft for farm work those who are not familiar with the work of farming, in an attempt to replace the experienced farmers already drafted. It is universally the experience of a practical farmer to find that the only really effective farm hands are those who have had farm experience and been hardened to farm work.

The article by Mr. Krock so ably discusses this very difficult problem that I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

I further request that the letter I wrote on October 9 to Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, the Director of the Selective Service System, and the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, be inserted in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM CRISIS EMPHASIZES LACK OF MANPOWER  
RULE—FIXING OF ARMY'S SIZE AND A CENTRALIZED AUTHORITY TO DECIDE WHO WILL FIGHT OR WORK LOOM AS VITAL NEEDS—  
AGRICULTURAL AREAS HARD HIT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, October 10.—The crisis over manpower came, like other crises in the war program of the United States, as an expected guest for whom no adequate preparation had been made. It followed in sequence the emergencies over production, inflation, the rubber shortage and other problems that have been raised by the war and permitted to reach an acute stage before they were met.

From the time the "arsenal of democracy" was created by high administration policy, these consequences were obvious: High pay in the armament industries and the administration's protective attitude on organized labor's demands would attract farm workers away from the land. The absence of a general selective-service policy on deferring farm labor would induce local draft boards to siphon it too heavily into the Army, particularly since the average American rural citizen is not willing to ask for deferment from combat service. The longer a decision was withheld to draft youths of 18 and 19 the greater would be the drain on adult farm and industrial labor.

All these results were to be foreseen when plans for the Army were set at 2,000,000 and 4,000,000. But with the entrance of the United States into the war, the continued reverses of the United Nations and the saturation of British manpower for the fighting services expanded the American Army plan by necessity to many millions more. All the consequences were intensified and the crisis came more rapidly to a head.

SHADOWY OUTLINE

It came in shadowy outline, insofar as computation of its scope is concerned, and the outline will remain vague until the size of the Army is determined. Then it will be possible to work out these vital equations, how many—men and women—must be left on the industrial and rural production lines to supply that Army and prevent the destruction of the American farm economy; what regulations will be required to effect an over-all selective service for the military and civilian groups.

While, as in the instance of savings, the administration still talks sympathetically of the voluntary method of manpower allocations, the general expectation is that compulsion will be necessary as it has been proved to be in the field of savings. A great many observers think they detect in the lingering official emphasis on a voluntary system the same hesitation in coming to grips with reality that has afflicted Washington's dealings with inflation, the rubber shortage and the draft of youths. A number of these observers are convinced that not until the November elections are past will the manpower thistle be firmly grasped.

But grasped it must be if anything approaching solution is to be found of this most vital matter on which, as much as on anything else, the winning of the war depends. And ever since the President brought back word that the country is far ahead of Washington, and is ready to do much more than Washington has found the resolution to ask, hope is growing that the administration will come to grips with the manpower problem sooner than had been generally expected.

DAIRY AREAS DESPERATE

This refers to the administration of manpower for the duration of the war, a fixed and orderly regulation covering all phases. But in the meantime conditions in the dairy

and livestock areas have become desperate; farms are being abandoned and herds sold or slaughtered. And, in the areas of ordinary farming, fields that grew food-crops are being turned to grass wherever the requisite labor can be found to do that.

These conditions have impelled local authorities, such as Governor Harold Stassen of Minnesota, to set up interim manpower regulations while waiting for the Federal Government to act for the Nation as a whole. But such devices can only be stopgaps because a Governor's writ does not run beyond the boundaries of his State, and migrant labor needs no passports to cross them.

A graphic illustration of what is happening in general farm areas was offered recently by a Virginia county agent of the Department of Agriculture. It is important because it is widely typical. Interviewed by the Clarke Courier of Berryville, County Agent C. C. Funkhouser said that farmers in his jurisdiction will curtail 1943 crops from 20 to 40 percent, the latter figure applying to the corn crop. Labor, he said, is demanding from 40 to 50 cents a shock to cut corn which has a market price of only \$3 a barrel. He attributed the shortage of labor "to people leaving the county for Front Royal, Winchester, and Hagerstown" to engage in war work at high wages. About 15 automobiles, carrying these workers, leave the county every day, said Mr. Funkhouser.

He spoke of apples rotting on the trees for lack of labor, and predicted that the county schools will have to be closed next year, and town stores closed at times, if the apple crop is to be harvested in any considerable measure.

There are more than 5,000 counties in the United States, and in all which contain farms the story is much the same.

CLEAR POLICIES

Students of the problem, including those who examined the prospect of it in the last war (it did not fully materialize for numerous reasons) believe that the Federal manpower law must test on certain clear policies. Women must be substituted for men workers wherever possible. Non-war industries must be heavily curtailed. Non-war manufactures must be severely limited to a very few types, which will release manpower automatically for armed service and war industry. The slogan of the Government must be "work or fight."

No strike, they say, can be permitted in a war industry but in non-war occupations alone. Strikers or "higher-wage shoppers" in essential industry, or in any activity that affects it, should lose any draft deferment status they have been granted and new jobs should be foreclosed to them. This would be accomplished by a prohibition to employers against hiring any labor not released to them by order of a Government employment agency.

But as the base of all these regulations the size of the Army must be determined so that the numbers required to equip and supply it can be known. When that is done the status of farm and war industry workers with reference to draft deferment will have to be fixed as a rigid guide to the local boards and to the civilian manpower authorities.

DIVIDED AUTHORITY

As matters now stand, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey's agency determines who shall be inducted into the Army and when. But there is also a Federal Manpower Commission under Paul V. McNutt, and between the two there is no clear modus operandi. Also, General Hershey has compulsory powers, and as yet Mr. McNutt has none. It is generally accepted that an administrative authority must be set over both agencies so that, John Jones, farm boy, white-collar boy, or industrial worker, can be classified according to a



clear manpower policy. The longer this is delayed the more desperate manpower conditions will become, and the more difficult it will be to finally correct them.

In what is envisaged as necessary the right of volunteer enlistment would no longer be granted by the Government.

OCTOBER 9, 1942.

Brig. Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,  
*Director, Selective Service System.*  
The Honorable PAUL V. McNUTT,  
*Chairman, War Manpower Commission.*

DEAR SIRS: I am writing this joint letter, as you are the two officials with authority to relieve, or to make recommendations to remedy, a most serious condition that now confronts the farming industry in America and which, unless dealt with promptly, will result in a dangerous reduction in the production of food.

America, in this World War, must be not only an arsenal for democracy but must be the bread basket for democracy.

Farm labor has been drafted from the farms without giving individual consideration to the need and indispensability of those drafted. To my personal knowledge, farm owners, operators, and skilled farm hands have been drafted which will result in a loss of food production. But worse than that, the Government itself has been paying such high wages for Government work and for work in defense plants that the farms have been drained of labor essential to maintain the standard of food production so vital for our success in winning the war.

I write as one with a personal knowledge of this problem, and I hope you are fully cognizant of the shortage of farm labor as a direct and contributing cause of a greatly lowered production of food.

It is imperative, I think, that prompt and firm action be taken to remedy this situation, but let me emphasize that only those physically capable of farm work can render efficient service on the farm. It would be the height of folly to continue to draft experienced farm hands, and then later to draft for farm work those who are not familiar with the work of farming in an attempt to replace the experienced farmers already drafted.

The farmer cannot continue to do his part in winning the war and have his labor drafted on one hand and, on the other, have his labor enticed by high Government wages to other activities.

I know you believe, as I do, that the production of food is absolutely essential to winning this war. The time has come when action can no longer be delayed, and something effective and prompt must be done to avoid any further depletion of farm labor. In fact, this depletion has gone so far that action is necessary now to replace the labor that has already been taken from the farm by the high prices paid in war industries and by the draft.

With best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

HARRY F. BYRD,  
*United States Senate.*

#### FARM LABOR AND WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION ACTIVITIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial published in the Killdeer Herald, of Killdeer, N. Dak., entitled "W. P. A. Still Going." I insert this editorial in the RECORD with the thought that the farmers in North Dakota are having a desperate time getting men to work on their farms, but at the same time, the editor says, the W. P. A. has men working on W. P. A. projects.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION STILL GOING

Frank Osterwind, of the Marshall country, was in Killdeer Wednesday on business. Frank recently returned from Fargo, and while there he noticed a Work Projects Administration gang tearing up old rails of an abandoned rail line, which project has been going on for some time.

In the meantime—as an evidence of lack of coordination between Government agencies—our agricultural college at Fargo and our university at Grand Forks have closed until October 20 so that the students can go out and help with the threshing.

Why this rail-pulling stunt could not be postponed for a couple of weeks while the Work Projects Administrations get out and help the farmers is a question that's too deep for us.

#### CLASSIFICATION OF ALIENS OF ITALIAN ORIGIN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at this time I wish to commend the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Biddle, for his Columbus Day speech, in which he announced that 600,000 unnaturalized Italian aliens living in the United States would be removed from classification as enemy aliens. I ask unanimous consent to print at this point in my remarks a letter I wrote to the Attorney General praising him for his action and requesting at the same time that he take similar action on behalf of German people and others of Teutonic origin in this country.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 15, 1942.

HON. FRANCIS BIDDLE,  
*Attorney General of the United States,  
Department of Justice,  
Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL: The forthright action taken by you in your Columbus Day address, announcing that 600,000 unnaturalized Italian aliens living in the United States will be removed from classification as enemy aliens, is, in my opinion, deserving of the highest commendation and wholehearted endorsement by our citizens.

Moreover, I believe you should promptly take similar action for the hundreds of thousands of Germans and others of Teutonic origin, because I believe they are just as loyal and patriotic as are the 600,000 Italians.

That this action should be taken by you, I believe, is especially true where German people have sons or daughters serving in the military forces of this country. In my judgment, the record and antecedents of the average German are such that these people should also have the benefit of the very humane treatment that you have accorded the Italians. I know that you will agree with me in the appraisal of these people as being inherently solid, honest, and substantial, and the very high places in the Army, Navy, and the Air Forces now occupied by men of Germanic origin attest to their dependability and loyalty.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER,  
*United States Senate.*

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR GUFFEY AT MEETING OF PHILADELPHIA DEMOCRATIC CITY COMMITTEE

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator GUFFEY at a meeting of the Philadelphia Democratic City Committee at Philadelphia, Pa., on October 11, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL ON MANPOWER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of manpower delivered by him in the Washington Star Forum on October 14, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY DR. T. V. SOONG, MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Dr. T. V. Soong, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China, at Carnegie Hall, New York City, on October 10, 1942, under the auspices of United China Relief, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### AMERICANS OF ITALIAN ORIGIN—COLUMBUS DAY ADDRESS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, at the Columbus Day celebration in Carnegie Hall, New York City, entitled "Americans of Italian Origin," which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PRICE CEILINGS ON FARM PRODUCTS— ADDRESS BY JOHN BRANDT

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by John Brandt, president of the Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., discussing price ceilings on farm products in connection with recent legislation, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### DIFFICULTY OF MEETING DRAFT QUOTAS

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Some Counties Can't Meet Draft Quotas," published in the Lincoln Star of Lincoln, Nebr., of the issue of October 10, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PERMANENT PEACE—ARTICLE AND EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Victory—For Humanity!," written by Alfred W. Palmer, and an editorial entitled, "Up To Congress!," both published in the issue of the Christian Century of September 30, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### IN MEMORY OF LT. COMDR. DAVID HURT

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem written by Mr. Frank T. Witten, of Tazewell, Va., in memory of Lt. Comdr. David Hurt, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE COURT IS NO ADJUNCT—EDITORIAL FROM THE HARTFORD COURANT

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial, entitled "The Court Is No Adjunct," published in the Hartford Courant of Oct. 5, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### INTEREST IN ELECTION LAGS—ARTICLE FROM THE RICHLAND COUNTY, N. DAK., FARMER-GLOBE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Richland County Farmer-Globe, of Wahpeton, N. Dak., entitled "Interest in Election Lags," which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

#### ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CO- OPERATIVES IN THE SALE OF RADIO TIME

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I believe the resolution (S. Res. 305), which I submitted a few moments ago, can better be

explained by reading a part of a letter written by Mr. John Carson, who, as Senators know, was formerly private secretary to the late Senator Couzens, and who now represents the Cooperative League of the United States of America. In this letter, which is addressed to me, Mr. Carson says:

I am happy to know of your interest in the resolution adopted by the thirteenth biennial congress of the Cooperative League, United States of America, through which the league reported what we sincerely believe to be unjust and unfair discrimination practiced against the league by the National Broadcasting Co. and the Columbia Broadcasting System, both of which companies refused to sell time to the league.

This is not a matter which concerns the Cooperative League only. It is a matter of vital importance to every consumer, to every radio listener, to the entire public interest, and we sincerely believe to the radio companies, particularly to the independent broadcasting companies. One of those companies already has recognized the importance of this matter to broadcasting companies, and as the facts are developed, we think every other independent company will join in welcoming a constructive inquiry into the matter. That is what the league asks.

The Cooperative League, United States of America, is the educational arm of the consumer cooperative movement. The league is made up of 21 great regional or wholesale organizations which are owned by several thousands of local or retail cooperative organizations, and which in turn are owned by some 1,500,000 to 2,500,000 families. Because families may be owners in one or more local cooperative organizations, it is difficult to determine precisely the number of families, but I think it is fair to say that from 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 of our citizens are now associated in these cooperative organizations.

Mr. Carson further says:

The broad issues involved here were first raised, to my knowledge, when the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce conducted an inquiry which led up to the writing and the adoption of the Communications Act, 1934. You may recall that I had much to do with that investigation, as I was then secretary to Senator James Couzens and clerk of the committee. During the inquiry we discussed at great length the problem presented by the control of radio facilities by broadcasting companies. In fairness to the radio companies, I think it was agreed that they should have and must have certain authority to determine what persons or groups of persons should be permitted to use the facilities. For example, we agreed the radio companies should have authority to prevent use of radio for purposes of slandering citizens or groups of citizens.

But it was then recognized that the grant of authority, implied or otherwise, to the radio companies demanded also the fixing of some definite responsibility. It seemed inevitable then that this difficulty would arise, and it has arisen on many occasions. The broadcasting companies should be most concerned over it, and I think the men with vision in that industry will be and will welcome a constructive inquiry. For in this situation presented by the Cooperative League is what we believe to be the exercise of harsh and arbitrary action, a condition which may become explosive unless correctives are applied now.

Mr. President, Mr. Carson continues in the letter and narrates just what the Cooperative League of America has attempted to do, and states that the broadcasting companies have finally declined to sell time to it over the air.

I wish to read a signed editorial published in the Burlington Daily News, of Burlington, Vt., on October 9, 1942. The editor and publisher of the paper, Mr. William Loeb, signed the editorial. It is not very long, and I think it is worth reading to the Senate. It is as follows:

[From the Burlington (Vt.) Daily News of October 9, 1942]

#### THE COOPERATIVE WAY

In today's paper there is an authoritative article on the accomplishments of the Vermont Electric Cooperative, Inc., Eden Mills, Vt., indicating their accomplishments for the past year. In these war days when everything and every energy is devoted almost entirely to producing weapons for destruction, it is most encouraging to read of the work of an organization which has been able to raise and expand the standard of living in the past year.

This is a perfect example of what free people, working in a free and democratic fashion by cooperating with each other, can accomplish. This is the American way, not the way of financial oligarchies from Wall Street or ruthless bureaucratic dictatorship from Washington.

That this report should come out now is especially significant. Yesterday Wallace J. Campbell, head of the New York office of the Cooperative League of the United States of America, announced that the league intended to ask the Federal Communications Commission to investigate the refusal of the National Broadcasting Co. and the Columbia Broadcasting System to sell radio time to the league. According to Mr. Campbell, the cooperative organization had planned to present a radio program entitled "Let's Get Together, Neighbor" on 30 stations from coast to coast next Sunday as the first in a series to promote its cooperative efforts.

It is charged that neither the National Broadcasting Co. nor Columbia Broadcasting System would sell any time for this purpose. This paper has often complained of the overzealous and silly censorship of certain Washington bureaus, and this act by National Broadcasting Co. and Columbia Broadcasting System hits some sort of a new high record. Here is an organization whose ideals and reputation are of the highest caliber which is denied an opportunity to sell an ideal to the public, even when it was prepared to pay for it. The radio chains are perfectly willing to take money and sell time to advertise many commercial products whose real value to the public may be gravely questioned.

This act by the National Broadcasting Co. and the Columbia Broadcasting System deserves not only thorough investigation by the Federal Communications Commission, but the censure of every free and living American and especially the numbers of various cooperative associations and their friends.

We suggest that supporters of the cooperative movement write in to the National Broadcasting Co. and also to the Columbia Broadcasting System and freely and forcibly express their feeling on this kind of high-handed action. It would be well also to write to Charles Hasbrook, the owner of WCAX, which is a member of the Columbia Broadcasting System and which advertises itself as the voice of Columbia in northern Vermont. It is to be hoped that Mr. Hasbrook is a real friend of the cooperative movement, and not a mere pawn of vicious, vested interests.

If this is the case, he will do his best to influence the Columbia Broadcasting System to abandon its absurd and entirely antisocial attempt at the suppression of free speech. Each and every member of a Vermont cooperative should await with extreme

interest a clearly defined statement from this radio owner. It is a matter which cannot be talked around or overlooked. He will either go to bat for the cooperatives or give silent assent to the Columbia Broadcasting System.

More power to the cooperative movement throughout the United States.

WILLIAM LOEB, Publisher.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in my remarks without reading an article published in the same newspaper entitled "A Letter From West Virginia Gave Power to Vermont Farm—As a Result, 1,200 Rural Homes Now Have Electric Light, Other Necessities—Via Eden's Co-op."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington (Vt.) Daily News of October 9, 1942]

A LETTER FROM WEST VIRGINIA GAVE POWER TO VERMONT FARM—AS A RESULT 1,200 RURAL HOMES NOW HAVE ELECTRIC LIGHT, OTHER NECESSITIES—VIA EDEN'S CO-OP

(By A. Ritchie Low)

Electricity and what it means in the home and on the farm is an old story to many of you. You've had your home lit up with it these many years, and you've long since taken electricity for granted. But to those who have had it installed but recently, it's regarded as something just too good to be true.

Take the story of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Naramore, who live over Lowell way, for instance. Mrs. Naramore has been postmistress there for quite a spell, and her husband the owner of a country store that is an institution in that part of Orleans County. They'd long hankered for electricity. They'd visited many of their friends who had it, and longed for the time when the wires would be strung and they, too, would enjoy it. But they weren't too optimistic about the prospects. There aren't many thickly settled neighborhoods over Lowell way, and the big power companies weren't especially interested.

Then one day, out of a clear sky, something happened, something that has since changed their manner of living, something that has made life a bit easier not only for the Naramores but the entire countryside miles around. It all came about as a result of a letter Mrs. Naramore found in the mail one day.

#### ADDRESS POSTMASTER

This letter was addressed to the postmistress at Lowell, Vt. Nothing unusual about that, to be sure, for every Tom, Dick, and Harry who has something to sell, if he doesn't know of any names in a community, will take a long chance and simply address his correspondence to the postmaster. In this case, however, the one who sent it mailed his letter not to the postmaster but to the postmistress. This indicated he knew more than did the majority who cluttered her wastebasket with their epistles.

Mrs. Naramore picked up the letter, looked at it closely, and noticed that it had been mailed in a town in West Virginia she'd never even heard of. It was mailed first class, too, and so it was with interest mingled with curiosity that she tore the envelope open and began to read. She read it once, she read it twice, and then went to her husband and showed it to him.

"Donald," she said, "here is a letter from a fellow by the name of Harry Bowman who wants to know if we are interested in having electricity in this section. I don't know any more about him than you do, but you know how often we've wished we had it. Read his letter and see what you think. At any rate, Donald, it would do no harm to write him and see what's on his mind. It might lead to something."



## LETTER GETS RESULTS

Lead to something, it certainly did. As a direct result of that letter received back in 1935 in the tiny post office at Lowell, up in Orleans County, a host of farm wives are now enjoying the use of electric washing machines, vacuum cleaners, and gadgets, and farmers electric milkers and coolers and other farm appliances.

Harry Bowman was in my study telling me about it the other day. I must admit I was a bit curious as to how he happened to write to the postmistress of a small town in northern Vermont. Remember, when he wrote the letter he was then living in Romney, W. Va., and wasn't likely to know much about Vermont, to say nothing of an isolated community way up among its hills.

It all came about this way: "I had just sold out my electrical business in West Virginia," he explained, "and was looking for new fields to enter. I got hold of a friend who supplied me with information as to the rural sections of the United States that needed electricity. After I looked over the list I chose the most likely places, places where I knew I stood some chance of doing business. Vermont was on the list, and Lowell, as I glanced at the map, looked like a likely prospect, since it seemed to be the center of a good dairy section. I didn't know a soul there. Never even heard of the place, but I knew it had a post office, and so I sat down and wrote to its postmistress. The rest you know. Does that answer your question?" I told him it did.

Now, what I've told you is not the end of the story. As a matter of fact, it is but the beginning. Not only did the Naramores in Lowell get electricity, but also their fellow Vermonters in 35 other northern communities. But let's not get ahead of our story.

"After the postmistress got your letter," I said to Harry Bowman, "what happened after that?" This seemed to me like a good question because you and I get letters every day that we do nothing about. We don't even throw them in the fire. We just lay them aside thinking that maybe we'll do something about their contents later. But most of the time we just let the whole matter go by default. We can't be bothered. And besides we're very busy we explain to ourselves. You know how it is.

## A GOOD BEGINNING

Mrs. Naramore, as postmistress, always hankered to have electricity so that she could sort the mail quicker. It isn't an easy matter to sort papers and letters and parcels and other odds and ends that come into a rural post office with the aid of old-time conveniences. Besides she always wanted to have the usual household appliances that electricity makes possible. And her husband, he, too, always looked forward to the time when the power line would come his way so that he could install the up-to-date improvements he felt his numerous customers were entitled to, electric refrigeration, etc. Donald Naramore is a progressive country merchant and he wanted to have as modern a store as the next fellow.

And so one night, after the day's work was done, he went to the corner desk and dropped Harry Bowman a line. He'd read his letter, he went on to say, and what did he have to offer? Soon in the mail was a second note postmarked West Virginia, to the effect that soon Bowman would come to Vermont and look the situation over.

After Bowman and Naramore talked things over, it was decided to interest the neighbors, call a meeting and discuss the whole proposition. When the farmers from the surrounding countryside realized that this fellow who had come into their midst was not of the fly-by-night type but really knew his business and was genuinely anxious to help, interest immediately began to increase. So far as

getting electricity was concerned, it looked as though they were getting somewhere. That is what the dairymen were saying one to another as they wound their way home across the mountain road after their first get-together with Harry Bowman.

Having interested the people of the countryside, his next job was to interest Washington. Easier said than done, however, especially when you consider his inexperience. Harry knows lots about running a power plant and how to string wires along a State highway and all that sort of thing but is pretty much of a novice when it comes to winning friends among the governmental higher-ups and influencing Senators and Congressmen. But there's one thing Harry does know how to do, and that is to exercise patience, also how to hang on. And hang on he did.

## COULD WASHINGTON HELP?

He sent letter after letter to Washington to explain the whole project. He told the powers-that-be in glowing terms, as glowing and vivid terms as he knew how, what an opportunity there was for the Rural Electrification Administration to really get down to business and do things in northern Vermont. But Washington wasn't especially interested and gave him the run-around. Yes, they said, they were glad to get the information, they were pleased to be informed and when the auspicious time came, etc. If you've had dealings with some of the Federal big wigs you can fill in the rest for yourself.

But there were two Vermonters who believed in Harry Bowman's proposition, men who knew Lowell, its people and its needs and who felt something should be done about it. They were Mel Clark of Burlington and Leon Going of Richford. Both went to bat, got results, and soon things looked a bit brighter. Another Vermonter who, Bowman says, helped lend a hand was Tom Cheney of Morrisville.

One day an important looking letter came from Washington. The whole project, the writer went on to say, had been reconsidered. The Rural Electrification Administration was interested and would Mr. Bowman please hold himself in readiness so that he could take a field representative over the territory? The very next mail carried an answer. Yes, indeed, Harry Bowman would gladly hold himself in readiness and when was the field representative to be expected? Soon he made his appearance and the two covered the Lowell, Westfield, and other nearby sections together. The Rural Electrification Administration advance man was a regular fellow and the two got on well together. Yes, said the field man in his report to headquarters, the whole area looked good to him and northern Vermont should surely be considered as likely Rural Electrification Administration territory. Harry Bowman was a happy man. So far so good!

## MOVEMENT UNDERWAY

It was in just some such fashion that what is now widely known as the Vermont Electric Cooperative got its start. Today it is a growing concern with 540 miles of power lines, over 1,200 patrons, and assets of over half a million dollars. When you remember that Bowman and the Naramores and their little band of cooperatively minded farmers didn't really get started until back in 1933, you can see how far and how fast the movement has traveled.

The whole line wasn't built at once, to be sure. As a matter of fact, the first project consisted of but 53 miles of line, although each year has seen farm houses, schools, and stores added to the cooperative's list of patrons. The growth has been both steady and encouraging.

## NOTHING DONE BEFORE

It is sometimes asked why, if the farmers all along have wanted to be served with

electricity, something has not long ago been done to meet this need. The answer is not hard to find. Sections of Orleans County are but sparsely populated, and the private utilities have never felt they would be justified in spending money to build a line. Farmers, to be sure, needed the "juice," but what about a return on the investment? Where would dividends come in? And there must be dividends, if such an expenditure were made. This explanation, it seems to me, is the reason why up until recent years, thousands of our farm people haven't had electricity.

There is an aspect of the Vermont Electrical Cooperative that makes a distinct appeal to hard-headed Vermont farmers, I'm told. It is this: Each patron is a partner in the business, each is a stockholder, every patron has a vital interest in the welfare of the organization. To use a biblical phrase they are "members one of another."

When you buy juice from a private company, you own no more in it after you have been paying your bills for 10 years than you did after the first 12 months. With the cooperative whose headquarters are in Eden, however, this is not so. Every bill you pay helps to pay off the mortgage since the rates set up by the directors amortize the Government loans. By and by, the organization will be clear of debt and it will be owned, not by a handful of men whose original capital was invested, but by the patrons themselves. Farmers and others like this aspect. It is a prospect that pleases them very much.

## MIND THEIR BUSINESS

Another thing. They realize that, if it is their own business, it is up to them to mind it, to put into office men good and tried and true, men who've made a success of their own farm or business, men who'll run the cooperative along the right lines, men who'll think not only in terms of profits but also in terms of service, service to their fellow men. That the right men have been put into places of responsibility is proven by the progress that has been made.

Here is the list of officers: President, E. T. Hubbard, Jeffersonville; vice president, Stephen H. Washer, Johnson; secretary-treasurer, Harry Drown, Eden; directors, James Barry, Fairfield; Julius Morse, Underhill; Carl Scott, Montgomery; and Jasper Cummings, Coventry. J. S. O'Hara, of Morrisville, is the Government inspector who makes the rounds on behalf of the Federal authorities and sees to it that the wires in the homes and barns are properly set up and connected. O'Hara, a half-brother of Harry Bowman, has been most helpful from the very beginning of the project. He has had a hand in getting the whole movement in motion, and the patrons are appreciative of his unselfish services and helpful spirit.

## NEW PATRONS WANTED

"Suppose," I asked Mr. Bowman, "there are farmers living near your power lines who want to 'hitch on' and be served with electricity; how do they go about getting it?"

"That's a good question," he replied, "and one we're always glad to answer. Glad, because it is our aim to be of service wherever we can. In direct answer to your question, I should say that if farmers in an area want to link up with us, the thing for them to do is to let their wants be known, and on our part we'll send up a man to go over the area and see if there are enough to make it worth while. If there are, we say so and suggest meeting in some hall or church vestry to talk things over. That's the usual procedure."

Asked if a prospective patron had to take out stock before he could be served, Bowman replied that this was not necessary. They did ask, however, that those who intended to get electricity from the cooperative take out a membership fee which amounted to \$5.

Questioned whether any contracts were signed, I learned that it was found helpful in the stabilizing of the cooperative to ask patrons to sign a contract for 1 year. It stipulated that the signer would pay a minimum rate of \$3 a month for that period.

Rates have remained the same so far, stated Bowman. He was quick to point out, however, as I have already tried to do, that the difference between paying a bill to a cooperative and paying it to a private utility lies in the fact that eventually the former's patrons wind up by actually owning the business. Every payment goes toward an eventual ownership. That is what makes it a cooperative.

In fairness to the power companies, this leader also pointed out that what made such organizations as Vermont Electric Cooperative possible were Federal Government loans made at very low rates of interest. Asked whether they'd been able to meet their obligations so far, he smiled. "Not only have we met every note on schedule, occasionally we've been able to repay loans ahead of time," declared Bowman.

#### READ OWN METERS

I admit I was a bit surprised when told that each man reads his own meter. This was something new under the sun, new at least to me. I'd never heard of the like before. "You see," he explained, "when each man has a stake in the business, there is no reason why he should not be truthful. If he should cheat he would be cheating himself."

Not only do the farmers and storekeepers and others read their own meters, in addition they make out their own bills. I wanted to know how they would know how to do it. I went on to say that I knew no more about reading meters today than I did 20 years ago, and that I'd be using electricity in the meantime. Meters were just a mass of unintelligible figures to me, I told Harry Bowman. But enterprising fellow that he is, he had thought of that.

When a fellow signs up with the Eden Cooperative, he explained, he is given a chart that is as plain as the nose on your face. It isn't complicated but simple; you don't have to be a mathematician to read it nor a financier to make out your bill; and that is why farmers and others have gladly cooperated by using it. They like the idea of being trusted, and the fact that by reading their own meters they save overhead appeals to their Yankee sense of thriftiness. It is true that meters are read by someone from the office once a year, at a time when no one has advance word of it, but so far this routine has but confirmed the belief of their leader that the overwhelming majority of our farm people are honest.

The leader of the Vermont Electric Cooperative told me that it costs from 25 to 30 cents a meter to have a man go from place to place and stated that with over 1,200 patrons they were able to save considerable money in overhead. This, in turn, made it possible to keep rates at a minimum consistent with good business management.

#### PAYS TRIBUTE TO AIKEN

In making mention of those whose early help had made this cooperative possible, Harry Bowman paid a fine tribute to former Governor, GEORGE D. AIKEN, who, when in office did everything in his power to lend a helping hand. Gov. William H. Wills had also, he said, evinced an interest in bringing electricity and its benefits to the people of the countryside. Harry Drown, too, had been one of the early boosters of the movement, and his election as secretary-treasurer was an indication of the high esteem in which he was held by the patrons.

"A lot of fellows have had a hand in this business," he modestly told me, "and I wish you'd make this plain when you write up your story." I told Harry I'd do just that.

Once, a meeting the farmers and others belonging to this co-op get together, elect officers, talk things over, and make plans for the future. This year's annual meeting will be held in Eden next Tuesday, October 13. It begins around 10 o'clock and winds up in the afternoon. Dinner will be served at noon and there will be time for an old-fashioned visit before the afternoon session. Some of the neighbors, especially with gas rationing, haven't seen one another for some time and this will be an occasion when old ties can be renewed and friendships cemented. A large attendance is expected.

#### DREAM BECOMES TRUE

Little did Mr. and Mrs. Donald Naramore dream, when they got Harry Bowman's letter mailed from West Virginia back in the middle 1930's, that within 8 years not only would they have electricity but also 1,200 other Vermonters would in over 30 towns. Little did they dream that there would be held in the neighboring town of Eden a gathering of the members of one of the largest cooperative movements in the State of Vermont, and that their answering that humble letter would have everything to do with it.

As I've sat here in the study of the United Church writing this story, one question has been running through my mind. Maybe it has been running through yours, too.

Suppose the Naramores had never answered the original letter?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield, to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska that this matter was called to my attention some days ago. I was indeed surprised that the National Broadcasting Co. and the Columbia Broadcasting System took the position they did. As I understand, they first took the position that they would not permit the cooperatives to broadcast because, as they said, the matter was controversial. Later they took the position that other advertisers using their facilities might object.

Mr. President, I can see no reason in the world why the broadcasting systems should not permit the cooperatives to broadcast if they pay for the service. I can see no reason why the broadcasting systems should not permit cooperatives, if they are operating in the national interest, to be given the same opportunity to be heard over the radio as farm organizations and other groups which are trying to promote identically the same thing among the farmers. There are those who are opposed to the cooperatives, as the Senator no doubt knows, because they think the cooperatives may interfere with their profits, or their dividends, and that their operation may tend to bring down the cost of living to the average man. Certainly there can be no excuse whatever for the National Broadcasting Co., the Columbia Broadcasting System, the Mutual Broadcasting System, or any other broadcasting system denying cooperative organizations, some of them the largest in the country, some of them outstanding in the work they have done, the right to buy time, simply on the ground that the subjects they may discuss are controversial.

Mr. President, probably everything said over the radio on the subject of

politics is controversial. If the broadcasting systems are to take the position that they will not permit anything to be said over the air or any time to be sold on any subject which is in the slightest degree controversial, then, of course, they are going to be able to pick and choose exactly what they will permit to go on the air. The broadcasting systems permit radio commentators, who are paid by some of the large interests in the country, to go on the air and discuss matters which are highly controversial. They are permitted not only to give the news but to edit the news, and to make comments, which are, to say the least, of a highly controversial nature. I think the action by the broadcasting systems is taken purely on the basis of their own selfish interests, and not on the basis of the best interests of the country as a whole.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Senator from Montana. The statement he has made is of the same nature as the one I was going to make, so it will not be necessary for me to make it.

I should like to call attention to the fact that the question goes much deeper than whether one likes a cooperative or does not like a cooperative. It is a question of whether broadcasting systems, which are given access to the air which God has given us so freely, should be allowed to prevent being heard over the air the views of an organization which is responsible, which is honest, which has a definite idea to present. The question whether the idea it has in view is right or wrong is not material when discussing the principle involved. The cooperative desires to present to the people of the country what it believes to be a great movement which is now in vogue in many sections of the country. Those who had charge of the proposed program did not anticipate that objection would be made to their presentation of the program. They asked for time, were willing to pay for it, and expected that they would be given time as anyone else is given time. They arranged for a great hook-up on the subject, Let Us Get Together, Neighbors.

Their program is a sort of fraternal one. They wanted to get the people together in this hour of distress and tribulation. They had all the arrangements made, but all at once the broadcasting systems said they would not permit them to broadcast because the subject matter, as the Senator from Montana said, was controversial. When the broadcasting systems were pressed in writing to give a reason for the position they took, they had to go back on that statement.

Mr. President, the subject matter of the proposed broadcast may be controversial. In my opinion, however, that is no reason why it should be kept off the air, especially when, as Mr. Carson shows in his letter, the movement in question represents between six million and eight million families in the United States. Such an organization, however, is not allowed to go on the air and advocate its theories. That seems to me to be a direct denial of a fundamental right.



The writer of the editorial which I read supposed that those who were denied this right were going before the Federal Communications Commission with respect to the matter. The resolution I have submitted, which calls for an investigation of the subject, has been referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce. I asked that it be referred to that committee because it occurred to me that possibly an amendment to the fundamental Radio Act would be necessary in order to cure this situation. As stated in the editorial which I read, it is recognized that the broadcasting systems must have some leeway. They are faced with responsibility. There is no question, however, that if they had permitted the cooperatives to go on the air they would have run no risk of libel suits or anything of that kind. Therefore, I can conceive of no reason for objecting to this great organization going on the air, especially in view of the fact that the subject of the broadcast was Let Us Get Together, Neighbors.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad the Senator from Nebraska read the editorial from the Vermont newspaper and gave it due recognition. The Burlington Daily News is one of the very few newspapers in my State which is not controlled by corporations, principally utility companies, and it is showing a great deal of courage in taking the stand it is taking. It made particular reference to the Eden Mills Electric Cooperative. In spite of almost insurmountable difficulties which have been thrown in its way by the public utilities companies, that cooperative has striven to furnish electricity to the people in that section of the country. Day before yesterday I attended its annual meeting in the little village of Eden Mills, which has a population of perhaps 2,500. Three years ago last May I took a great deal of pleasure in throwing the switch which turned electric current into the first 150 farms of this cooperative. For 20 years the farmers had tried in every way they could to obtain electricity. They had been on their knees trying to get electricity into that community, which, financially speaking, is one of the poorer communities of the State. They had begged and pleaded, and had been turned down. The private corporations had sent men in there to survey the country. They reported that such a project would never pay dividends on the investment. It is probably true that such an investment on the part of the subsidiary of the New England Power Associates would not have paid dividends; but day before yesterday it was reported that the cooperative had made its first payment of \$35,000 due to the Rural Electrification Administration. It had done more than that. It had paid \$10,000 on next year's payment. That had been done in this rural, thinly populated territory, which the utilities said was absolutely worthless for investment purposes.

There are other rural electric cooperatives in Vermont which have been es-

tablished over the opposition of private corporations which have been determined that if they themselves could not serve a community they would do everything within their power to prevent anybody else from serving it.

I believe that the Rural Electrification Administration has been one of the outstanding Federal agencies. It has done a great deal of good in the particular community to which I refer. Farmers were enabled to install milking machines and milk coolers, instead of abandoning their farms. They are contributing tremendously to the food production of this country today because of the cooperative electric line which was built. They are still operating under difficulties. They are unable to obtain priorities for furnishing electricity to large dairies only 300 or 400 feet from existing lines. I do not know what the reason is. The reason given is a shortage of copper. I suspect, however, that a great deal of pressure has been exerted to prevent the expansion of the R. E. A. cooperative in any way at this time.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his very valuable contribution. I am reminded by what the Senator from Vermont says that the organization which is complaining is a perfectly respectable national organization. No one who is in any way familiar with its operation would say that it is doing or trying to do a dishonorable thing. Under the cooperative theory it is carrying electricity to farmers who could not have obtained it in any other way, as Vermont has demonstrated, and as is being demonstrated all over the country.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to call to the Senator's attention the fact that a few years ago we had a grain cooperative in North Dakota. The newspapers attacked it and claimed that it was insolvent. They finally wrecked it. We had a hearing before the Federal Trade Commission, and it was nearly 3 years before we obtained a decision in favor of the cooperative.

I did not hear the Senator from Nebraska read his resolution. I was absent from the Chamber.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not read it.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder whether the Senator could make provision in his resolution whereby the committee would report back, say, within 3 weeks or a month, so that we could obtain prompt action.

Mr. NORRIS. The resolution contains no such provision. It has already been referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, over which the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] presides as chairman. I anticipate that there will be no delay in the committee in taking action on the resolution. It provides for the expenditure of \$1,000 from the contingent fund of the Senate. At first I thought I should ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, but I wish to do as I think this

cooperative organization has done. I wish to lean backward in being fair to anybody who opposes it. I wish to give anyone who opposes it an opportunity to be heard and let the committee decide whether the law should be amended or whether justice can be obtained without amending the law. This may not be the only case. There may be others of a little different nature. So far as this controversy is concerned, I admit, for the sake of argument, that those on both sides of the question are perfectly honest. I do not see how there can be any dispute. The organization represents between 6,000,000 and 8,000,000 families of American citizens, who should have the right to advocate on the air what they believe should be done, in the same way as the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, or any of the various corporations or associations appears from time to time over the radio.

Mr. LANGER. Has not the Federal Communications Commission the power to cancel the license of a broadcasting station?

Mr. NORRIS. I think so. Mr. Loeb, the author of the editorial in the Vermont newspaper, is of the opinion that complaint should be made to the Federal Communications Commission. After looking over the editorial and reading other things besides what I have put into the Record, I have reached the conclusion that possibly if complaint were made to the Federal Communications Commission the result might be that the complainants would lose, on the theory that an amendment to the law is necessary. Personally I do not believe that to be true, but I wished to obtain the judgment of the committee, which 7 years ago reported the bill which later became the present act. Under all the circumstances, I believe that the best course to pursue is to submit a resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate Commerce to investigate all the facts.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7672, making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7672) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. What action did the Senate take? My attention was distracted for a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to proceed to the consideration of House bill 7672 has been agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is too fast. That does not conform to the understanding in the RECORD. I am surprised that the Senator from Tennessee, without conferring with me, would rise when I was engaged in conversation with another Senator and move to make the bill the unfinished business. On last Tuesday we had a definite understanding, which appears in the RECORD on page 8102. Following a colloquy I stated:

Then, with the understanding that the Senator may have permission to file the report, and upon the request of any Senator not familiar with the record or the bill, it may go over until the next session of the Senate, I shall not object.

Mr. McKELLAR. I remember that perfectly well; and I will live up to it.

Mr. McNARY. Will not the Senator ask for a reconsideration of the vote by which his motion was agreed to?

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator wish to have it reconsidered?

Mr. McNARY. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator a question. Would it not be better to let the bill become the unfinished business?

Mr. McNARY. No; I wish to conform to the record. That is my style. We had a perfect understanding. I may or may not object later; but I do not want any Senator to rise and make a motion quickly when I am otherwise engaged, and have a record made which does not conform to the record made a few days ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not know that it did not conform to the RECORD.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator certainly remembers the agreement made a few days ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. I remember it perfectly; and I will live up to it entirely.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which my motion was agreed to be reconsidered, and that the motion be withdrawn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be delighted to renew the motion later.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Chandler	Johnson, Calif.
Andrews	Chavez	Kilgore
Austin	Clark, Idaho	La Follette
Bailey	Connally	Langer
Ball	Danaher	McCarran
Barbour	Downey	McFarland
Barkley	Doxey	McKellar
Bilbo	Ellender	McNary
Bone	George	Maloney
Bulow	Gerry	Maybank
Bunker	Green	Murray
Burton	Guffey	Norris
Butler	Gurney	Nye
Byrd	Hatch	O'Daniel
Capper	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Caraway	Hill	Overton

Pepper	Thomas, Idaho	Wagner
Radcliffe	Thomas, Okla.	Wallgren
Reed	Thomas, Utah	Walsh
Russell	Truman	Wheeler
Schwartz	Tunnell	Wiley
Shipstead	Tydings	Willis
Spencer	Vandenberg	
Stewart	Van Nuys	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKEN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### PICTORIAL CRITICISM OF THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not want to take more than a brief moment of the Senate's time, but I feel it is due the Senate and the country to call attention to a picture appearing in the November issue of the magazine known as Click. The picture purports to represent the United States Senate in the midst of war. Ordinarily, I do not answer my mail on the floor of the Senate, but I now hold in my hand a letter which I received a few days ago from Mr. Wade H. Nichols, editor of Click, calling my attention to an article in the November issue on the subject of A Victory Congress. I shall read the letter in order that it may go into the RECORD:

CLICK, INC.,

New York City, October 2, 1942.

Senator ALBEN BARKLEY,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: I am sending you, under separate cover, a copy of Click magazine for November. Featured in this issue is an article titled "Victory Congress" (p. 3), which I believe you will find of particular interest because of its constructive and sincere consideration of matters which must be of grave concern to you, as they are to all who now shape America's destiny.

Since our magazine must return many times in the future to similar consideration of the responsibilities and achievements of the Congress, I would be deeply grateful for any remarks you might address to me as evidence of your own reaction to the article mentioned. I feel that your attitudes and aspirations should be reflected in our attempts to contribute to the thinking of our readers—your constituency.

Please be assured that I would be happy to publish any letter which you might care to

compose for public consumption, or to hold in confidence any comments which you might indicate to be personal.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely yours,

WADE H. NICHOLS, Editor.

I have read the article referred to in Mr. Nichols' letter. With much of it I agree. I am not prompted to rise at this time to discuss the article itself, but in order that I may discuss a picture which accompanied the article, which is held out to the American people as a fair representation of the Senate of the United States in the midst of this great world crisis. I should be glad to have other Senators look at the picture. It occupies more than half of the first page of the article. So far as I can count and identify Senators whose likenesses appear in the picture, the picture shows six or eight Senators on the floor of the Senate. We all know that it is against the rules of the Senate to take pictures of the Senate when it is in session. No one is allowed to take pictures of the Senate when it is in session, either from the floor or from the galleries. We have never departed from that rule. On one or two occasions when the Senate took a recess to receive some prominent guest, such as Winston Churchill, Queen Wilhelmina, or King George of Greece, permission was given to take a photograph of the Senate during the addresses delivered by the distinguished guests; but under the rules of the Senate, when it is in session, no one is allowed to take a picture; and, so far as I recall, that rule has never been knowingly violated or suspended. No one could object to a picture of the Senate which was truly representative, and the rule of the Senate on that subject was not promulgated years ago in order to protect the Senate against itself.

However, the magazine contains a picture, Mr. President, obviously taken from the floor itself, just within the door on the eastern side of the Chamber, and the picture purports to be that of a session of the Senate. I shall read the headline appearing over the picture:

This picture should make you fighting mad! This is the United States Senate, debating the confirmation of a major Presidential appointment. Try counting the Senators who are present—out of 96.

Mr. President, that picture was not taken during the existence of the present war. It was not taken since war was declared in Europe in 1939. I do not know exactly when it was taken; but it is obvious that it was not taken since April 1939, because in my place here, seated in the chair which I usually occupy, is Senator James Hamilton Lewis, who died on April 9, 1939, 6 months before war broke out in Europe. I do not know how long before that time the picture was taken. I have tried to identify some of the Senators shown in it. Back of my seat, in the seat which he used to occupy, sits Senator Ashurst, of Arizona. Across the aisle, in the seat usually occupied by him, sits the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. Seated to his left is a man who—if he is a Senator—has been difficult to identify, even by using a magnifying glass. It has



been difficult for the minority leader and me and other Senators to identify who the person is, but evidently he is not here now. Over on the right, at the last desk in the front row, some man is standing with at least one foot in the chair. Toward the rear is the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. There are on the floor eight men who are supposed to be Senators, and the picture is supposed to be a picture of the United States Senate in the midst of world war, a great war crisis, and it is held out to the American people as portraying a typical session of the Senate in this great crisis.

I presume that the article to which Mr. Nichols, the editor of the magazine, has called my attention is an editorial, because it is not signed by anyone; so far as I can see no writer's name is signed to the article; and inasmuch as Mr. Nichols sent it to me, I presume he is the author of the article or editorial. I do not attribute to Mr. Nichols any ulterior motive. I do not know whether he knows anything about when the picture was taken. It may be that he thinks it is a typical picture of the United States Senate.

However, regardless of that, here is a magazine which is purchased at all the newsstands of the United States—or, rather, I should say that it is for sale at newsstands. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] corrects me by saying that it is "for sale," but I presume that it also is purchased by large numbers of persons; because it could not be published indefinitely without being sold to some persons, and I myself have bought it when traveling, when I wanted some light reading and relaxation, and I wanted to get my mind off serious matters of state. At such times I have purchased one of the magazines such as *Click*, *Pic*, *Look*, or *Don't Look*, or *Stop Looking*—whatever the name may be. [Laughter.]

I have sometimes bought this magazine. It is a picture magazine; it does not pretend to be anything else; it advertises itself as a picture magazine, and frequently it contains very attractive pictures. I happen to see now a very amusing picture to which I will call the attention of the Senator from Oregon.

The magazine is for sale on all the newsstands in the United States. I have no objection to any of the pictures it prints for fun or for entertainment or for any other reason; but I do seriously object to any magazine or publication having one of its representatives sneak into the Senate on a day when the Senate is not in session and take a photograph when there are only six or eight Members on the floor. It may be that the photographer may have been here before the Senate met or after it had adjourned, because it is impossible that that picture could have been taken while the Senate was deliberating, without a violation of the rule of the Senate. The picture does not even include the chair, the Vice President's desk. So we do not know whether anyone was presiding.

I am calling the attention of the Senate and the country to this obvious fraud on the Senate of the United States, this effort to picture us in the midst of a great crisis, with war all around the world,

and when we are sending out boys by the million to the battlefields. It is an obvious fraud to picture the United States Senate in the midst of this crisis with only eight Members present deliberating upon an important Presidential appointment. I do not know, of course, what appointment it was. We all know that in the late afternoon in the Senate when we reach the Executive Calendar and there are no appointments except those of postmasters, which are confirmed en bloc, that Members do not feel any urge to remain here to find out who has been appointed postmaster at Pedunk or Podunk or any other place in the United States.

I think it is unfair to the American people; it is unfair to the very voters to whom this article is appealing, to send out all over this Nation what seems to me to be a phony, bogus picture of the United States Senate and represent it as depicting the lack of interest, the lack of concern, the lack of industry on the part of 88 Members of the Senate, who are unidentified as being absent, although there are 8 Members said to be present, one-half of whom cannot be identified even with a magnifying glass.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, it seems to me that it goes a good deal further than the Senator from Kentucky has indicated. We all recognize that dictatorships are on the increase throughout the world and we all realize the shortcomings of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, for we know the shortcomings of human beings, and the Congress is made up of human beings.

But what these false and unfair attacks upon Congress tend to do is to create in the minds of the people the idea that parliamentary government is a failure, and when such articles and pictures as the one the Senator from Kentucky has called attention to are printed those responsible are playing into the hands of the very people whom they have denounced—the Axis, the Hitlers, the Mussolinis, and the others who say that democracy is a failure. They are instilling in the minds of the people of this country the idea that the parliamentary government is a failure, and if such an idea is sufficiently instilled into the minds of the people they may rise up and do what they have done in other countries where the parliamentary system has been discredited; they may want to do away with the Congress of the United States entirely, and set up a dictatorship in the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I said a while ago at the beginning of my remarks, there is much in this article which I can approve. Anybody has the right to urge the people to vote for the right sort of Members of Congress, for those whom they believe will serve the people. I find no fault with that. But in the course of this article the writer refers to a former Congressman, Zioncheck, who committed suicide and who was engaged while in Washington, as we all recall, in many more or less foolish

episodes and escapades. Certainly his actions were not representative of the Congress of the United States, and I do not see why a man who was elected and has gone on to his reward—whatever it may be; I think he died by his own hand—should be held up as typical of the Congress of the United States in order to warn the electorate against that sort of a representative.

I am as much interested as anyone else possibly could be in the election of strong, patriotic men to the Senate of the United States as well as to the House of Representatives. In the course of this article we find pictures of Daniel Webster, Abraham Lincoln, John Quincy Adams, and Cordell Hull as representing the type of men who ought to be elected to the Congress. We cannot refute that. We all have the highest respect for Cordell Hull, with whom we have served here, and we all know that Daniel Webster, Abraham Lincoln, and John Quincy Adams were outstanding and distinguished Members of Congress a hundred years ago. The inference is that there is no one now in Congress worthy to tie the shoelaces of these men, except that the article does refer to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Norris] in terms which we all approve, as the type of an outstanding statesman in the Senate of the United States. According to this article he is the only man in the Senate who measures up to the standards of proper senatorial qualifications. I am willing to say that the Senator from Nebraska goes further than most of us in fulfilling those qualifications, but I do not believe the Senator's friends would say that he is the only man in the Senate who is fitted to be a Member of this great body, much as we admire him and much as we hope he will continue to serve us and the country in the Senate.

The magazine contains a picture taken from the campaign that was started in the State of Washington entitled "Bundles for Congress." It portrays the dome of the Capitol and a crazy-looking horse flying through the air with some sort of a load on his back, and over in the left-hand side another horse is laughing, evidently giving Congress the horse laugh.

Under the words "bundles for Congress" are the words "Esmeralda to the rescue. Do not worry about the war and taxes. Get that pension—Forget the Axis."

I have stated here before, and I think we all recognize, that the so-called congressional pension law as a part of the retirement act applying to Government employees was an unfortunate act upon the part of the Congress. Congress realized that immediately, and repealed the law. Yet this article which is sent out all over the United States contains this picture as a typical representation of the Congress of the United States, although in one sentence in the article it is stated that Congress has done a pretty good job.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Sena-

tor from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to call the attention of the Senator to the table, which appears in the article, of some important legislation which has been enacted by the Congress in the past few years. The table appears on page 5 of the magazine. There is a heading "Before you vote how did your Congressman vote?" and then are listed eight controversial questions which have been passed upon by the Senate and the House since 1939:

- The repeal of the arms embargo.
- The renewal of trade pacts.
- The draft law.
- Sending the Army abroad.
- The lend-lease bill.
- Transferring Axis ships to Britain.
- Extension of draft law.
- Repeal of the Neutrality Act.

The author of the article requests its readers to judge individual Members of Congress by the votes which were cast upon those eight measures. In other words, the article says to its readers, "If your Congressman supported these measures, then your Congressman was a worthy representative of the people, and was working for victory."

Inasmuch as each one of these acts was passed by the Congress, the standard which the author sets for individual Members of Congress was met by the Congress as a whole. If the argument be proper that a Member of Congress who voted in favor of any of these acts is a good Congressman, then it also follows that the Congress which passed those acts was a good Congress.

Mr. President, that reminds me of a statement the Senator from Kentucky made to me only a few days ago when we were discussing this general subject, namely, that much of the criticism of the Congress has been based not on what Congress has actually done but upon the activities of those who have opposed the policies which were finally adopted. This Congress has been a victory Congress as the record clearly establishes.

But attention should not be diverted from the fact that when the Congress was taking these actions, as, for example, the repeal of the arms embargo, which I think was in November 1939, there was a great division of opinion in the country as to whether that was right or wrong. There was a very large proportion of the public which in November 1939 was of the opinion that the United States could avoid entering the war. There were a great many citizens in and out of Congress who hoped that it would be possible for us to avoid entering the war. The debates which took place here were characteristic of democracy in action. The result has been the organization of an economy for a victorious war from which there is now no dissent.

As for the photograph to which the Senator has so pointedly drawn attention, it seems to me it offers an opportunity to call attention to the fact that one of the cherished rights of freemen, the right of free speech, is protected in the United States Senate better than it

is protected anywhere else in the country, if not in the world. This is practically the only legislative body in the world in which a Member may rise and discuss any question about which he feels the country at large should have some information.

In my opinion, this photograph was probably taken while a Member of the Senate was discussing some matter which he regarded as important, but which was not actually at issue at the time, and which, therefore, did not demand the presence of all Senators. Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives know that most of the work of a legislative body is done in committee, and not upon the floor.

We know that frequently, while the Senate is in session, for example, numerous committees are also in session. We know that the reason why Senator James Hamilton Lewis was sitting in the seat of the majority leader, if this was indeed a session of the Senate, was that as the whip of the Senate it was his duty to watch the proceedings, so that if anything of current importance should arise he could notify the Members of the Senate.

We know that we are frequently called to the floor from committee rooms by the attachés of the Senate when matters of importance to us in our States, or of importance to the public at large, arise. So that even as those now in the gallery look down upon what is transpiring at this moment, they may be misled into the belief that those Senators who are absent are neglecting their duty. The Senators who are absent are either attending some committee meeting, or, for the most part, are attending to business in their offices, or are attending to the innumerable tasks which we have to perform in the departments and bureaus of the Government.

We are now discussing a matter upon which no vote is to be taken. We are merely expressing our opinions in respect to an article appearing in a magazine, but if any Member of this body should now rise to suggest consideration of some measure on the calendar, the first step taken would be for some Senator to rise and say, "I suggest the absence of a quorum," so that absent Senators could be summoned to the floor before any action could be taken. One of the principal duties of the majority and minority leaders is thus to protect the public and the Senate against action except by the will of the Senate.

I have interrupted the Senator merely because I think it is important to call attention to the manner in which the Senate actually works. I have no doubt in the world, as I said a moment ago, that when the photograph to which reference has been made was taken the business of the Senate for that day had been completely transacted, and some Senator had risen to make a speech on some matter which he thought was of public importance, but which had no relation to any pending business.

In the years in which I have served in this body and the previous years during which I had the opportunity to observe

its actions, I have seen some of the most eloquent and able Members of the Senate rise and speak to empty chairs, when they were talking not upon a pending issue but upon some other matter upon which public opinion was at the time only in a formative stage. Such speeches, addressed to the public at large, do not require the immediate attention of the whole Senate. It is upon such occasions that attendance falls off, but when controversial issues arise then almost every seat is occupied.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. Of course, we all know that human nature is such that more publicity and more attention is frequently given to a fight in the Senate, or in any public body, made by a single person against some proposal, than the passage of the act itself receives; that frequently, because of the rather distorted publicity, the country is calculated or liable to receive an impression of the Senate according to what it reads in the newspapers about somebody who is opposed to or fighting something, and they forget that the Congress as a whole, or the Senate as a whole, acts entirely contrary to the position taken by a man who is fighting a measure and who, therefore, gets more publicity concerning it.

The Senator from Wyoming has pointed to the list of legislative acts referred to in the article. All those laws were passed. Congress passed every one of them, and they were controversial. They were debated according to our practice and our privilege here, this being almost the only body left in the world where there is freedom of debate.

We all grow a little impatient now and then at the length of debates, but none of us would be willing to abolish the right to speak on the floor of the United States Senate. My complaint is that the isolated instances in which the Congress may act unwisely are exploited and magnified and publicized as a representation of the character and ability of the Congress, and sight is entirely lost of the fact that over a period, over this particular war period, as I think everybody who is fair minded must say, the Congress of the United States has done an excellent job in its legislative program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I add another word?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think attention might be called to the fact that probably every Member of the Senate received a letter from the editor of Click asking him for his comment. The result which has been achieved may not have been beyond the contemplation of the editor. He has received, and his magazine has received, tremendous advertising which it would not have received had the picture not been printed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to the advertising which Click or any other magazine can obtain which will enable it to sell its product, but I think it is unfair to falsify a legislative body, in whom the people of the United States



ought to have confidence, and in which I believe they do have confidence, by going back 4 or 5 or 6 years—heaven only knows how far back they went to get this picture—and sending it out all over the United States as representing the Senate of this country in the midst of a great war. I believe this magazine and the editor of it should apologize to the American people for publishing that kind of picture as representing the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. In my service in this body I have seen what is represented by the picture duplicated probably 200 times, but it was at a time when the Senate was not in session.

I desire to say also that I have never seen the Senate in session when some Senator was not on his feet, and if the picture to which reference has been made purports to show the Senate in session during this period, when the United States is engaged in war, with James Hamilton Lewis present in the Senate, the picture is a fake and a fraud, and the man who wrote the story has plastered it all over with badges of fraud; but it is quite typical, sir, of some of the wretched and miserable stuff which has been written about the Senate and House of Representatives in recent years, including the "bundles for Congress" story.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely desired to call attention to the obvious fraud which has been perpetrated on the Senate and the country by a picture taken by someone who slipped in and which has been held out to the American people as typical of the deliberations of the Senate.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am not among those so much disturbed by criticism of Congress, or individual Members of Congress, because, as the distinguished majority leader knows, the able former Members of Congress to whom he referred suffered much more serious criticism than has been inflicted upon any Member of Congress in our time. But I am very much concerned with a matter which is related to this subject, and I rise to ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks, a very interesting article which appeared in the September issue of American Mercury entitled "Boston's Fight Against Rumors." I respectfully urge Senators who have not yet had an opportunity to read the article to give it their attention.

It points out very clearly the grave dangers which are created as a result of the whisperings and activities of men of evil minds or little minds. It points to how the city of Boston has undertaken, by way of a so-called rumor clinic, to track down and dissipate rumors which are designed, it appears to me, to have a disastrous effect upon our war program. I understand that similar so-called rumor clinics are being or may be established in other cities. I want the article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD partially for the purpose of bringing it to the attention of people here in the Nation's Capital, in the hope that a like clinic may be established here at the seat

of Government, so that we may aid in bringing to light the falsity of these rumors, and probably, if the program is intensively carried out, find some of those responsible for them.

Mr. President, I should like again to urge Senators to examine this very important article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Mercury of September 1942]

#### BOSTON'S FIGHT AGAINST RUMORS

(By Elsie McCormick)

"This is on me," said a man in a Boston saloon, "I'm celebrating. Just got the first letter from my boy in Australia. He's a corporal now." "Australia?" echoed a stranger beside him at the bar. "No cause to celebrate, my friend. Hundreds of the soldiers who went out there are right back here in Boston now. Insane. Bad food, terrible living conditions. Why, I'm told there's not even room for all of them in the hospitals \* \* \*." Another false and vicious rumor had gone to work for the Axis.

But this particular rumor did not do as much damage as its originators had hoped. The bartender, who had been leaning idly over the cash register during the conversation, wrote it down as soon as the two men had gone and sent it off to the Rumor Clinic, field headquarters of Boston's unique battle against the corrosion of wartime gossip and enemy propaganda.

A few days later, both the rumor and the answer were printed in the Boston Herald's "Rumor Clinic" column, posted on bulletin boards in factories, announced by speakers at meetings, slipped into department store pay envelopes, wrapped up and sent by laundries to customers along with the clean wash. There wasn't a word of truth in it, according to Army authorities. The facts were that only 47 men in the military service had been returned to Massachusetts for mental care. Not one of them had come from Australia.

About the same time, a young workman was talking to a friend in a hash house near the water front.

"Is our Navy dumb?" he said. "A guy told me today that after they launched that big new battleship, they found there wasn't an antiaircraft gun on the ship."

This story also reached the Rumor Clinic, written on the back of a greasy menu card by the hash-house waiter. It was as quickly and publicly answered. It is quite usual to launch warships without complete installation of guns and other equipment.

Since they were founded last February, Boston's Rumor Clinic and the closely related division of propaganda research have collected, tracked down, and exposed hundreds of wedge-driving and alarm-spreading stories. Included on the advisory boards are the commissioner of police, the district attorney, the United States attorney, psychology professors of Harvard and Boston Universities, newspaper publishers, social workers, and representatives of the chamber of commerce, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the American Federation of Labor, and the Women's Trade Union League, as well as of the Irish, Jewish, and Negro sections of the population. Behind them stand many ordinary citizens of Boston, who loyally report every damaging story.

One of those most responsible for the rumor clinic is a blue-eyed, golden-haired Irish girl by the name of Frances Sweeney. Miss Sweeney had long been distressed by the anti-Semitic, anti-British, and defeatist rumors current among certain sections of the Boston Irish. Until suppressed by official action, Francis J. Moran, of the Christian Front, had released scores of new ones every

time he held a meeting in Hibernian Hall. For months Miss Sweeney had been attending such meetings, often standing up to challenge wild statements by the speakers. In one case she was forcibly ejected from the hall.

Last February, when the crop of destructive rumors was especially disheartening, Miss Sweeney went to William G. Gavin, associate publisher of the Boston Herald. They arranged to call a meeting of public officials and leaders of various groups to plan a campaign for counteracting rumors. A short time before that first meeting, the *Queen Mary* had entered Boston Harbor, stayed a few days, and departed. The newspapers had been requested not to mention it. But a steamer the size of the *Queen Mary* can hardly be hidden, even under a bushel of censorship, and stories were soon running wild around Boston. Prof. Gordon W. Allport, head of the psychology department at Harvard, suggested that each of the 12 persons at the meeting tell the rumors he had heard.

Each one offered a different story. The police commissioner had reports from Negroes that the *Queen Mary* was crammed with colored troops destined for suicide work in the war zone. A college representative had heard there was not a single Jewish soldier aboard, because they all managed to get out of overseas duty. Someone else offered the story of a mutiny. A social worker had been informed that the ship had gone out at night, ablaze from stem to stern, and a businessman had been told that she had sunk not far from Boston, with great loss of American life.

The rich variety of these fantastically false stories convinced all present of the need of a city-wide effort to fight rumor.

Out at Harvard, Robert H. Knapp, a tall, 27-year-old Oregonian, was working for his doctor of philosophy degree under Professor Allport. Mr. Knapp was put in charge of the division of propaganda research, organized under George C. Wiswell as part of the Massachusetts Committee of Public Safety, to track down and refute false stories. It came to be known as the Rumor Clinic. A column under that name began to appear weekly in the Boston Herald.

#### II

Among the tall tales first exposed was one to the effect that the British never bomb the Krupp works in Germany, because a block of shares in it is owned by Winston Churchill (the authors of this report ignored the repeated bombings of Essen, home of the Krupp industries).

William Harrison, a Negro newspaper editor, graduate of Harvard and a member of the rumor advisory board, found that most of the stories circulating among his people described wanton sacrifice of Negro troops. Another complete fabrication was that goods for Russia were being allowed to pile up on the local docks because our Government feared that Russia was about to make a separate peace. And workers had inquired if it were true that they wouldn't be able to buy any more hams, because all the hams in the country were being sent to Moscow. Irish working people reported a vicious, fantastic lie to the effect that Mme. Litvinoff, English-born wife of the Soviet Ambassador, possessed a great fortune derived from ownership of brothels in London slums. Rumors so deftly tailored to suit different groups are certainly not spontaneous.

As the rumor clinic became known, and the Herald's column punctured one crazy story after another, citizens of Boston responded and there was built up a network of volunteers who reported what they heard. (A strict rule of the clinic is that all letters reporting rumors must be signed.)

Barkeepers are in an excellent position to hear loose tongues and stand high on the list of these volunteers. John J. Kearney,

president of the local bartenders' union, has asked his 1,500 members to help the Clinic. Early in July more than 200 "morale wardens" were appointed by 4 important labor unions in the Boston area to report stories floating around the shops. They also distribute pamphlets and posters on the subject of rumor mongering, read bulletins at union meetings, and check the spread of Axis-inspired rumors by spreading the answers given in the Rumor Clinic.

The answers are supplied by the highest possible authorities—usually Army, Navy, and Government officials—and great care is taken not to reveal information of value to the enemy. Before the Herald's column is printed proofs are sent to each member of the advisory board and are checked in addition by the Army, Navy, and Federal Bureau of Investigation. Enemy agents are thus prevented from using the column for purposes of their own. The person who reported, under a fictitious name, that he'd heard there were only 12 antiaircraft guns on the Atlantic coast and then artlessly asked how many there really were and where they were located evidently had an even lower opinion of American intelligence than is usual among Axis agents.

It is easier to collect rumors and to expose their falsity than it is to track them down to their source.

Much of the tracing has been done by Miss Sweeney. This intrepid little Irish girl has run all over the city, climbing tenement stairs and ringing doorbells on Beacon Street in order to run an ugly story to its ultimate starting point. Generally, she meets a dead end at about the third person.

One of the most persistent yarns in Boston was that an American soldier, broadcasting from Australia, said: "After we clean up the Germans and the Japs, we're coming home to take care of the Jews." An advertising man explained that the story had been told him by the man at the next desk, who had actually heard the broadcast. The second man denied that he had heard the broadcast himself, but said that his wife had. The wife told Miss Sweeney that, while she hadn't actually heard the statement, she had got it from her mother. Her mother said that it had come, not from her radio, but from her German butcher. When Miss Sweeney tried to question the butcher, he blazed up, yelled that he would not stand for anybody's interference, and ordered her out of the shop. In tracking this rumor through another informant, Miss Sweeney ran it down to a German girl whose family had once belonged to the German-American Bund. The girl said that the broadcast had been heard by her fiancé, who had gone away. A third trail led straight to a member of the Christian Front, who also said that he had heard it himself, not as a broadcast, but sung by American soldiers as they sailed away on a troop ship. Even a Junior G-man who got his badge in a package of cereal could figure out where this rumor really came from.

### III

There is no doubt that a large proportion of the rumors current in Boston have been deliberately planted. One proof is the close correspondence between many of them and the reports beamed at America by the Axis short-wave broadcasts. The Reverend Walton Cole, a Boston Unitarian pastor, has long made a hobby of listening to the German short-wave radio and recording the high spots. Rumors circulating in Boston are turned over to him by the Rumor Clinic, to be checked against the voices from Berlin. More than half the stories reported to the Rumor Clinic were told on the Axis short-wave a week or two earlier.

According to another type of tale, useful in stirring up fears of treachery at home, a

submarine washed up on the Massachusetts coast had in its larder loaves of bread bearing the labels of leading Boston bakers. In the sailors' pockets were stubs of tickets from Gloucester movie theaters. This story was current in 1917. Its effect on gullible people is to make them feel there's a German under every bed, or that quantities of fellow citizens were giving the enemy aid and comfort.

It was reported that Italian fishing boats were seen leaving port heavily laden and riding low in the water, but riding high on their return—just the opposite of what might be expected from a fishing boat. The inference was that they were sailing out with supplies for subs. Facts punctured the story. No enemy aliens may fish off our coasts; all fishermen are carefully investigated before being given permits; such traffic could not exist under the watchful noses of Navy, Coast Guard, and local police.

Rumors which raise false hopes can be just as damaging as those which spread suspicion and fear. For instance, the canard, reported frequently from business circles, that Lloyd's of London was betting 10 to 1 that the war would be over by autumn. Several Massachusetts astrologers have been forecasting a complete Allied victory by the end of this summer, and the crushing of Japan by early fall. Predictions of both these types can do good service for the enemy. Hitler's agents engaged French astrologers, crystal gazers, and palmists by the score to soften up the country by forecasting an early peace and by describing the horrors that would be unleashed if the war continued. Reports which have reached the Rumor Clinic indicate that the enemy may also be deliberately using such predictions to influence American opinion.

German propaganda's attempt to take advantage of every cleavage in American life is shown by the effort to promote prohibition. All at once, Boston mothers began to ask the Rumor Clinic about widespread drunkenness in the Army camps. A check-up of the German short-wave radio showed that it had begun, a week or two before, to pour out false stories about Army camp drinking and to urge mothers to have liquor taken from men in the armed forces.

Government agencies have urged that what is being done in Boston be done elsewhere. No complicated organization or machinery is necessary—the Boston Rumor Clinic works efficiently with a handful of determined, intelligent volunteers, a courageous newspaper, and a thin, far-flung line of sharp-eared scouts. Even lone individuals can accomplish much, if they make it a habit, when an absurd, dangerous rumor comes their way, of asking, "Where did you hear that?" There is often no answer. Another effective rumor swatter is the citizen who takes out paper and pencil, says, "There's a hot one for my collection," and asks to have it repeated word for word. The rumor spreader will often be silenced by his own sense of shame.

The enemy is making a skillful effort to discourage, divide, and defeat us here at home. He is trying to invade our shops, our houses, and our clubs. We can stop him only if we guard our own lips carefully and challenge every story that might push us even an inch along the dark way of defeat.

### SEND IN YOUR RUMORS

What wild, damaging, morale-eroding stories similar to those described in this article are current in your community? Readers who wish to help the Boston Rumor Clinic, and further the organization of other such clinics throughout the country, are urged to write such stories down and send them to Division of Propaganda Research, Massachusetts Committee of Public Safety, 18 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in relation to the subject matter which has just been discussed by the able leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. It is a gracious thing on his part to undertake the defense of the Senate in the manner that he has. I have observed that he has always come to the defense of the individual Members who are assailed, or of the body itself when assailed, and I say it is a gracious thing for him to do—it is an evidence of real leadership.

I wish to add one word to what I have just said. We have all experienced attacks similar to those contained in this publication, in others of like sort. We will all experience them in the time to come in greater degree than we have up to the present. Let them rave. Let them publish what they please. We are not here answering any pictorial publication or answering any particular magazine. We are here to perform a duty, and when every man performs that duty according to his best judgment he has done his full part.

Mr. President, when Senators take time during a session of the Senate to defend the Senate from the implications which follow such a publication as that to which reference has been made then they have done the very thing desired by those who indulge in that sort of thing; they have had their day here after publishing an infernal lie, in which they have dealt with Senators who are now dead, and with persons who have had nothing to do with the actions of the Senate.

Mr. President, we have one thing to do, one thing alone. We will do our duty as we see it. I do not care a rap whether there is a publication called Click, or Dick, or Hick, or whatever it may be; I do not care a rap whether there is a PM, a QM, or some other kind of an M published in this country which remarks about or reflects upon Congress. I do not care a rap what such publications say so long as they say it in any sort of language that may be tolerated. I do not care a rap for what anyone says concerning my vote here. I vote as I please. I vote as I see fit. I vote exactly as God taught me to vote, and I do not care whether all the newspapers in the country rave, and rave, and rave about what we may do here.

To all of them I answer, I am here for a certain purpose. I am here standing upon my own two feet. I am here doing exactly as I see fit and what I believe to be right. I am here answerable to my conscience alone, not to any newspaper, not to any pictorials, not to any publications in the United States of America. I am here as an American, doing exactly as I see fit and as I see the right, and that I shall continue to do.

### PARTICIPATION OF NEGROES IN NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, the participation of the Negro in our general national activities and defense and war efforts has been of a definitely increased nature in recent years. Not since the days of Lincoln have the Negro men and



women been given the opportunities they have by this administration. Daily there are articles published showing the large number of Negroes employed in war tasks and that they are singularly honored in other ways.

I read an excerpt from an editorial in a recent issue of the Chicago Sun relating to the activities of the Negroes:

Negroes hold jobs of every grade of skill. There are metallurgists and electricians at the 18 International Harvester Co. plants; machine operators and heat treater working for the Winchester Repeating Arms Co.; millwrights and locomotive engineers at Carnegie-Illinois; operators in the highest paid brackets on the airplane production line of Pullman-Standard Car Co.; trusted supervisory employees at Inland Steel. Negroes are faithful workers; several of them have passed the 25-year mark in service at the plants surveyed. Negroes get along with their fellow workers.

The Wall Street Journal, in its issue of October 8, 1942, in a headline, says, "Negro Employment Is Rising Fast in War Industries. United States Policy \* \* \* Bring Economic Advancement for the Race."

Speaking of the aircraft factories, the article from the Journal says:

Today the 44 biggest plants employ more than 12,000 of the race.

The Journal further states that—

The President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice is establishing regional offices. \* \* \* The National Housing Agency and Federal Works Agency are putting money into colored men's pockets through clauses in every construction contract providing that Negroes must be hired in proportion to local population. The clauses are enforced.

Mr. President, last September I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the President's order referring to all loyal and qualified workers, in which the President said:

Industry must take the initiative in opening the doors of employment to all loyal and qualified workers, regardless of race, national origin, religion, or color.

In testifying before one of the House committees, Mr. Leon Henderson, when asked whether, in filling positions in his organization, he would give proportionate recognition to the Negroes of the country, said:

We have—and one of the things that I am quite proud of is—a letter from one of the Negro organizations saying that we were in the forefront in the recognition of Negro employees, and, in addition, we are working to insure that in communities that are largely Negro populated that Negroes are appointed as members on the rationing boards.

Further Negro participation in the war effort was given when the *Booker T. Washington*, named for a great Negro educator, was launched on the west coast. The 10,500-ton Liberty ship last week screamed down the ways of the California Shipbuilding Corporation at Wilmington, Calif. She was sponsored by Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, National Director of the Negro Affairs Division of the National Youth Administration; christened by Marian Anderson, the Negro contralto; and will sail for the United States Maritime Commission with a crew of Negro and white seamen under Capt. Hugh

Mulzac, of Brooklyn, licensed Negro shipmaster. At the launching were a daughter and two granddaughters of the late Booker Taliaferro Washington, for whom the ship was named. Born on a Virginia plantation just before the Civil War, he founded Tuskegee Institute, at Tuskegee, Ala., to train Negroes for teaching and for industry, and became his people's first great leader in their struggle for recognition.

I wish to read the following excerpts from an article in the Washington Star of September 20, 1942, entitled "Recognition Accorded Negroes as Fighters and War Workers. Most Significant Advance Being Made on Home Production Front":

The war is winning the American Negro recognition as a soldier and skilled worker.

On the far-flung battle fronts abroad and on the production front at home he is contributing his blood and skill to a cause which his leaders say he appreciates better than anyone else—the preservation of freedom and democracy.

Negroes comprise a substantial part—some say 40 percent—of the engineering troops building a strategic military road through the Canadian wilds to Alaska.

There are industries that employ Negro engineers, draftsmen, chemists, and scientists. In one Ohio defense plant a colored man is the chief metallurgist in charge of a staff of Negro technicians and is recognized as an authority on stainless steel.

The Government is setting the pace by employing increasing numbers of Negro men and girls as stenographers and clerks in the rapidly expanding war agencies. A separate Negro manpower service has been established in the War Manpower Commission under the direction of Dr. Robert C. Weaver, to expedite the movement of Negroes into war industries.

In the War Department, a former judge of the Federal District Court for the Virgin Islands, William H. Hastie, has been appointed civilian aide to the Secretary of War in charge of Negro relations.

A prominent colored woman, Mrs. Crystal Bird Fauset, is in charge of Negro activities in the Office of Civilian Defense.

The Manpower Commission has made arrangements to expand training facilities for Negroes in Baltimore and hopes that by such methods sufficient skilled labor can be drawn from the city's large Negro population so that additional workers will not have to be imported into a community whose housing facilities already are overtaxed.

Dr. Weaver estimated there are about 500,000 Negroes employed in war work.

During the last year Negro employment has increased greatly in shipbuilding industries.

In building the greatest military force ever assembled in this country, the Army is planning to use a substantial number of Negro troops. An all-Negro division is in training at Fort Huachuca, Ariz. At Tuskegee, Ala., Negroes are training to become air pilots. Negro women have been accepted in the WAAC's.

The Navy now is accepting enlistments for general duty. Negro sailors are being trained at Great Lakes, Ill., and Hampton, Va.

The marines also are enlisting colored fighters, recruiting a special Negro battalion of 900 men, which will be trained at New River, N. C.

Numerous Negro heroes already have emerged from this war to uphold the military traditions of their race in this country which go back to the Revolution.

An official release from the Maritime Commission of September 21, 1942, re-

lating to Negroes employed in the construction of the 10,000-ton vessel built at the California Shipbuilding Co. yard at Wilmington, Calif., sets forth the following:

More than 500 skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled Negro workers were employed in the yard as the *Booker T. Washington* was being rushed to completion. This represented an increase over the 278 Negroes employed there in March 1942.

From the Office of War Information, Navy Department, September 10, 1942, comes the following:

Negro recruits in the United States Naval Reserve are being given the same opportunity as other recruits to learn one of the several trades offered by the Navy at its two new United States naval service schools.

One such school is to be located at United States Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill., and the other at Hampton Institute, Va.

Negroes who have graduated from recruit training and entered the Navy as apprentice seamen have started in service school with that rating. Those who successfully complete the service-school course will be eligible, after a period of practical experience, for promotion to petty officer ratings.

Courses offered at Great Lakes include gunner's mate, radioman, quartermaster, signalman, yeoman, storekeeper, aviation machinist's mate, aviation metalsmith, and cooks and bakers.

Hampton Institute courses include ship fitters, electrician's mate, machinist's mate, metalsmith, carpenter's mate, motor machinist's mate, and ship's cooks and bakers.

Length of the school terms in the various courses range from 4 to 6 months.

In the May 15, 1942, issue of *Modern Industry*, in speaking of employer-employee relations, appear the following excerpts:

It is significant that the current increase in Negro employment is not confined to common-labor jobs. Negroes are operating boring mills, punch presses, lathes, high-precision tools. They are doing inspection work, drafting, using blue prints. In shipbuilding, some Negroes are gang bosses and supervisors. They are finding their places in research laboratories and engineering departments. And Negro women are getting jobs in munitions plants. \* \* \*

As early as July 12, 1940, Sidney Hillman, head of the labor division of the then National Defense Advisory Commission, designated an administrative assistant to develop national policies for integration of Negro workers into the training and employment phases of the national defense program.

The article further states that a year later, following appointment of the Negro Employment and Training Branch and the Minority Groups Branch in the Labor Division of O. P. M., President Roosevelt issued an Executive order establishing a Committee on Fair Employment Practice and requiring a nondiscrimination pledge in Government contracts. The article says:

This Executive order, the second Presidential decree in American history directly concerning Negroes, in effect, gives them the same economic freedom that the first decree—Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation—gave them in the field of politics.

Senators will note that through the years the many Republican administrations—the Republicans from time immemorial claiming to be the greatest friends of the Negro race—have failed

to issue any Executive order or take any action of consequence equivalent in significance and importance to the Emancipation Proclamation by Lincoln and the Executive order by President Roosevelt. The Emancipation Proclamation by Lincoln and the Executive order by President Roosevelt establishing fair employment practices and requiring a nondiscrimination pledge in Government contracts are outstanding events in the history of the Negro race.

Thus, Mr. President, I say that Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his administration have recognized, signaled, and honored the colored people as no other administration in this generation has done.

#### OUR NAVY

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, this year of 1942 finds the great navies of the world locked in a battle to the death. Nineteen hundred and forty-two finds every great remaining naval power straining its resources to turn out ships of war on an unprecedented scale. Nineteen hundred and forty-two finds the United States engaged in building the mightiest armada the world has ever seen—an armada upon which we depend for preservation of ourselves and our way of life.

There is bitter irony in these things; for this year of 1942 was looked forward to by the leaders of a generation ago as a naval landmark of a far different sort. Nineteen hundred and forty-two was to be the year in which naval armaments were finally to be stabilized on the basis of fixed ratios—ratios determined by peaceful discussion around the conference table. Under the Washington Naval Treaty this year of 1942 was set as the year when replacements would bring Great Britain and the United States to actual exact parity on capital ships.

It is a far cry back to those peaceful days. It is hard to recall those premature dreams of perpetual peace. We have learned much since then—learned in the bitter school of experience. I ask forbearance if I recall briefly something of this vanished age. Of one thing we can be sure; that today and for many years to come the safety of ourselves and our Allies will depend largely upon the wise development of our naval power, and in no better way can this be achieved than by bearing in mind the lessons of our recent naval history.

It is of greatest importance, therefore, that we should now pause in the midst of World War No. 2 to take stock of the vicissitudes of our Navy in the years since World War No. 1 and to survey the significance to the life of this Nation of the naval-expansion program begun in 1934.

Think back to that chilly November morning in 1921 when the representatives of all the great naval powers of the world met a few blocks from here, over in Continental Hall. Those black-coated diplomats and admirals were gathered to discuss a problem which loomed large in the minds of the American people—the problem of ending a naval armaments race which threatened eventually to destroy the peace hard won 3 years before. The years since 1918 had seen the Allies rent by dissension and suspicion over the growth of new vast fleets.

As the delegates gathered in the hall their minds must have been filled with the impressive ceremonies of the day before—Armistice Day, 1921—the day of the dedication of the grave of America's Unknown Soldier in Arlington. The memories of the tragedy of the War of 1914-18 were fresh in the hearts of everyone. Even the most belligerent delegate was conscious of the deep desire of the people of the world to avoid a repetition of that tragedy.

This desire was reflected in the proposals made by Secretary of State Hughes at the opening session of the Conference. Startling in their scope, those proposals involved a sharp cut in the size of the world's great navies, with equality between those of Great Britain and the United States. Japan would stabilize her Navy at 60 percent of those of the two great powers. So broad were the proposals that they provoked violent discussion, followed by weeks of intricate negotiations. In the end, however, the Hughes proposals won.

Under the pressure of public opinion throughout the world, the basic ratios were accepted, although all three principal powers had to make sacrifices to achieve this successful conclusion. Great Britain gave up a policy of many centuries, and her traditional position as possessor of the largest navy in the world. We, in turn, abandoned a building program which would have put us, in the course of time, in the lead among the world's great naval powers.

With Japan the situation was somewhat more complicated. She was unwilling to accept a smaller navy than those of Great Britain and the United States. In order to induce her to do so, a provision was put in the naval treaty forbidding the fortification by the United States or Great Britain of their possessions in the general vicinity of the Japanese islands. In return for this, Japan signed the Nine Power Treaty, in which the associated nations agreed to respect the integrity of China. At the same time the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was transformed into a four-power pact by the inclusion of the United States and France.

As a result of the Washington Treaty, the United States scrapped a total of more than 842,000 tons of naval vessels built and building, a larger amount than that given up by any other power. These included 2 first-line battleships, 17 second-line battleships already built, 7 battleships and 4 battle cruisers under construction.

Two things are noteworthy about the Washington Pact.

First, it recognized the political factors which must be present if any system of arms limitation is to work. The conference went outside the field of disarmament and took up the problems of fortifications in the far eastern area; the relation of Japan to a relatively helpless China; and the political relations between the great naval powers themselves as developed in the transformation of the Anglo-Japanese alliance into the four-power pact. In return for the non-fortification which prevented us from building adequate bases in the Philippines

and Guam, Japan gave up her claims to equality in capital ship strength and piously declared her lack of any aggressive intentions toward China.

But at the same time the conference failed to set a limit to the construction of anything except capital ships, because of the unwillingness of France to limit herself in so-called defensive types—cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. So we tried again.

In 1927 another conference was held at Geneva. There an attempt was made to seek a formula for the restriction of the number of cruisers, destroyers, and submarines of the principal naval powers. Once again no agreement could be reached, and the conference failed. Three years later, however, these classes were finally limited by the London naval treaty of 1930, initiated following conversations between Prime Minister MacDonald and President Hoover. Tonnage of all three smaller classes was limited on a 5-5-3 ratio. The treaty retained the Washington treaty figures for aircraft carriers—135,000 tons for the United States and Great Britain and 81,000 tons for Japan. Somewhat similar ratios were achieved with reference to cruisers, while destroyer tonnage was limited to 150,000 tons each for the United States and Great Britain, and 105,000 tons for Japan. With reference to submarines, the three powers agreed upon equality at 52,700 tons apiece.

Thus, with the tonnage of every class of warship possessed by every great naval power strictly limited by common agreement, the world believed that the specter of naval war had been banished indefinitely. In truth this was the climax of the era of disarmament. If all signers of the treaty had carried out its provisions with equal sincerity, as did the United States, Great Britain, and France, and had the problem of world peace been susceptible to solution by disarmament alone, the London Treaty might indeed have been a milestone in man's struggle for a better world. Unfortunately, Japan did not keep her pledged word; and the time for disarmament had not yet come. Instead of a milestone in the forward progress of civilization, this treaty was to be a gravestone of all our hopes.

The United States, at least, had done far more than observe her treaty obligations. Not only had we led in pressing for low limits for our own and other navies, but between 1922 and 1932 we did not even avail ourselves of the right to build the classes which were not limited. In the decade following 1922 we laid down the keels for only 31 vessels. In this same period Great Britain was building 112. More significantly, Japan was constructing no less than 142 vessels in this same era.

The motives for this neglect to build even up to treaty strength were of the highest—the desire to give the world an example of a great nation willing to put her trust in good will rather than the sword. But regardless of the high character of our motives, the results were disastrous for our naval power. In the vital categories of cruisers, submarines, and destroyers, we lagged far behind in



the construction of modern vessels. At the end of this period, despite the maintenance of the 5-5-3 ratio for capital ships, the United States Navy had dropped to a poor third place among the maritime powers of the world.

The folly of this course was not long in becoming evident. The economic collapse of the post-war era was loosing new and terrible forces, forces which were to sweep the world into the present conflict. The forces began to work both in Europe and in Asia. Japan began secret fortification of her mandated possessions in the Pacific, as well as clandestine expansion of her Navy. These acts not only assured Japan domination of her own territorial waters, but gave her the necessary stepping stones for offensive action against American and British possessions in the Pacific.

A year and a half later, in September 1931, Japan embarked upon a military adventure which opened a new chapter of violence in world history. At the Washington Conference the Japanese had given sworn oaths to respect China's integrity in the open door. In 1931 Japan began the conquest of Manchuria. Her invasion was successful—and that success foretold the end of disarmament. The United States began slowly to awaken to the terrible possibilities implicit in this rebirth of aggression.

The advancing flag of Japan in Manchuria was reflected in the immediate introduction of bills in both Chambers of Congress to bring the Navy to full treaty strength; but we were still not fully aroused.

The bills did not go through.

From 1928 to 1932 not a single new ship was authorized for the United States Navy.

It is true that Congress voted funds for the modernization of several battleships and the completion of eight cruisers laid down under the provisions of the Geneva and London Naval Conference; but it was not until President Roosevelt assumed office in 1933 that a definite program was formulated to increase our Navy to treaty strength. This is indeed a tragic commentary, in the light of later events, upon the foresight of preceding administrations.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-three marked the turning point in our naval policy. In Germany a fanatical Hitler seized power. In Asia, Japan continued her absorption of Manchuria, unperturbed by the futile criticism of the rest of the world—criticism futile because unsupported by action. Obviously the clouds of war were gathering. The United States must act and act swiftly if we were not to be caught completely unprepared. We acted. On June 16, 1933, the National Industrial Recovery Act authorized the President to allot money for the construction of vessels within the terms and limits of the London Naval Treaty. Moving swiftly, the President apportioned \$238,000,000 for the construction of 23 ships, including 4 10,000-ton cruisers, 2 aircraft carriers, 20 destroyers, and 4 submarines.

In the next year steps were taken to increase the Navy to complete treaty strength. The Vinson-Trammell Act of

March 1934 provided for the immediate construction of one 8-inch-gun cruiser and three 6-inch-gun cruisers. More important, this act gave the President power to undertake, prior to December 31, 1936, construction of tonnage and auxiliary ships adequate to bring the Navy to the limits prescribed in the Washington and London Treaties, a program involving the construction of 102 ships.

The Vinson-Trammell Act was one of the most significant acts in American naval history, for it gave legal sanction to a Presidential policy that the United States Navy be brought to full treaty strength in all categories—providing, moreover, a continuing authorization for the replacement of over-age ships.

But we could not rest content with what we had done. Our rearmament was again spurred by events abroad. Germany had already begun construction of pocket battleships of the *Deutschland* class. In June 1934 the Italian Government announced the construction of two 35,000-ton battleships. In December came the crowning blow to the limitation system. Japan gave the formal 2-year notice that she would not be bound by the Washington and London agreements after December 31, 1936. Finally, in March 1935, Germany openly repudiated the disarmament clauses of the Treaty of Versailles. The next months she served notice upon the world of the construction of 12 submarines.

From this small beginning were to flow the great fleets of undersea raiders which at this very moment are ravaging the water-borne commerce of the United Nations.

Our concern with these events was strongly reflected in our naval building program. The naval supply bill of June 24, 1935, carried the Vinson plan forward with 24 vessels—2 light cruisers, 1 aircraft carrier, 15 destroyers, and 6 submarines. At the same time, the Army was authorized to establish air bases on the Aleutian Islands.

Looking back we can only thank God for this legislation. Today those ships and those bases are absolutely vital to the safety of our country.

Because of Japan's withdrawal, the Washington Treaty was to expire in 1936. Late in 1935, therefore, a new naval conference was called in London to attempt to salvage something from the ruins. It met on December 7, a day which 6 years later finally, irrevocably brought to a close the era of peace by disarmament. By 1935 German rearmament had already swung into high gear. Italy had joined the ranks of the aggressors by her conquest of Ethiopia. The people of Germany, Italy, and Japan had placed their destiny in the hands of men drunk with lust for power. Concentration camps and propaganda wars were appearing as portents of the struggle to come.

In this atmosphere it is not surprising that the London meeting found it impossible to accomplish anything of importance. Japan withdrew from the conference because of the refusal of Great Britain and the United States to grant her complete naval parity. In this

situation it was not feasible to set qualitative limits upon naval construction. However, the delegates did agree upon limiting the size of capital ships to 35,000 tons and armaments to 16-inch guns, and certain qualitative limits were established for other types. Except for these small points the conference was a failure, for the whole structure of limitation of the size of the world navies was being swept aside by the expiration of the Washington Treaty.

All this time the war clouds were gathering. Germany reoccupied the Rhineland. Germany and Italy intervened in Spain. The so-called anti-comintern pact was signed, giving monstrous birth to the Axis. Japan waged war upon China proper. In March 1938 Japanese fliers sank the United States gunboat *Panay* in the Yangtze River. Japan apologized. A year later German militarism swept over Austria.

Again Congress took action upon these new threats. In May 1938 the second Vinson Act authorized an increased total tonnage for the United States by 20 percent, and further increased the naval air force by 3,000 planes.

Munich came and went.

Czechoslovakia fell.

Finally, on September 1, 1939, all Europe burst into flames.

The preparedness program of the 1939 Congress on land, sea, and in the air, swept forward at tremendously accelerated pace. No dissenting voice was raised against the President's forceful declaration committing the Nation to defend at any cost territory and institutions of the New World.

The Naval Appropriation Act of May 1939 had earlier provided funds for the continuation of ships under construction and for the commencement of two battleships, two cruisers, eight destroyers, and many auxiliaries. Congress further appropriated \$65,000,000 for development of naval aviation facilities at various continental and overseas bases of the United States as a result of the Hepburn report of 1938, which had clearly demonstrated the need for increased fortification of our outlying and continental bases.

After war broke out in Europe, Congress passed the 11-percent expansion act and the 70-percent expansion act. In turn, these were followed significantly by 5 other authorizations, providing for a 2-ocean navy and an under-age fleet of a maximum tonnage of 3,750,000 tons. Supplementing this vast increase, Congress has passed bills authorizing construction of more than 3,000,000 additional tons. Of the 60,000-plane program for 1942 and 125,000 for 1943, the Navy is receiving a substantial allotment. Pending legislation provides an additional sum of almost \$4,000,000,000 for naval aviation.

These acts insure us a Navy of almost 7,000,000 tons—a four-ocean Navy—a Navy that will have adequate ships and planes of every type to secure the overwhelming naval and air superiority which is needed to accomplish the final and utter downfall of our enemies.

Three elements play equally important roles in a modern navy. They are ships—and I include both surface ves-

sels and airplanes—men, and bases. Bases are the very crux of the Navy's operations. From them are dispatched ships and planes for their every task. It is their facilities that repair battered ships, rebuild riddled aircraft, heal broken men. It is the bases that fuel the ships, feed the men, and fill the magazines with shells so that the fight can be carried unceasingly to the enemy. So important are they that under certain circumstances a single base can be worth a hundred ships.

Of world-shaking importance in the building of American sea power was the trade to Great Britain in 1940 of 50 over-age, flush-deck World War destroyers for a ring of mighty bases stretching from Newfoundland in the north to British Guiana in the south.

It was in September 1940 that President Roosevelt transmitted "for the information of Congress" an exchange of notes between the British Ambassador and the Secretary of State—

under which this Government has acquired the right to lease naval and air bases in Newfoundland and in the islands of Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, St. Lucia, Trinidad, and Antigua, and in British Guiana.

In the words of the President, it was an—

epochal and far-reaching act of preparation for continental defense in the face of grave danger.

The chain of bases, he said, would give the United States command of a vast portion of the approaches to North and Central America, the Panama Canal, and the northern part of South America.

Those bases may well prove to be the saviors of the Panama Canal, and they will assuredly play a large part in eliminating the submarine menace which threatens our coastal life lines.

So much for the battles for American sea supremacy fought and won in the Halls of Congress. But what of our Navy in action? What of our ships and men on the high seas, facing murderous salvos from below the horizon, streaking torpedoes from hidden submarines, and screaming bombs from the death-laden skies overhead? What of this Navy, maintained as an instrument of national policy, when it finally came within gun range or plane range of German or Japanese warships?

The first fact to realize is that the United States Navy is fighting this war—fighting it with guns, bombs, and blood.

We should be far behind in this eleventh month of war had not the Navy had calm foresight and well-laid plans for the protection of this Nation in the event of war.

For the American Navy, war began on September 4, 1941, when the United States destroyer *Greer*, carrying mail and supplies to Iceland, spotted with its supersonic equipment a German submarine lurking some 10 miles ahead in waters which had been declared vital to American defense. The *Greer* immediately took up the challenge. The German sub launched two torpedoes which the *Greer* skillfully avoided. Following this, she counterattacked with depth charges.

From that incident forward, the order to all Navy craft was "shoot on sight."

On the inky night of October 16, the war was suddenly brought home in earnest to the Navy. The destroyer *Kearny*, answering a call from a convoy attacked by a pack of U-boats, was torpedoed without warning at close range. Eleven men lost their lives in the explosion, and the entire ship would doubtless have been lost had she not been one of the newest design—with hard-steel plates twice the thickness of those used in the World War, and vastly superior compartmentation, which kept her afloat until she reached American shores.

Two weeks later, to the day, the most savage blow of all was struck. Steaming alone south and west of Iceland, the 21-year-old destroyer *Reuben James* was struck without warning by an enemy torpedo. Tragically, she had none of the advantages in design that were built into the *Kearny*. Her entire forward half exploded and sank at once, taking 100 officers and men with it.

An American warship had now been sunk by the Axis, but our Navy was valiantly fighting back against the unseen raiders of the deep. On December 21, Secretary Knox announced:

After careful weighing of the evidence, I can now state that in the Atlantic Ocean United States naval forces have, up to the present time, probably sunk or damaged at least 14 enemy submarines.

Thus, by the time the Japanese stabbed us viciously in the back in the Pacific Ocean, the United States Navy was already winning the first phase of the Battle of the Atlantic.

But let us not fool ourselves. Up to December of last year the true nature of this war had come home to no one. We were all numb to the incredible portents of the new order of naval warfare. Up to this time it was 1917 all over again. Some destroyers were lost in the stormy Atlantic, bringing goods to England. That was all. This was a little backyard squabble which we could win with our left hand.

Then it came.

December 7. On that day the United States of America was hurled by the terrible force of treachery into the greatest naval war in the history of the world—a naval war not on one ocean or on two but on the seven seas of the earth; a naval war which was to cost the United States Navy in the first 7 months more lives than all the previous naval wars in its history.

After that first stunning blow, through the bleak and dragging weeks of December and January, and even into February and March, the Navy was the target for endless storms of the most acrimonious criticism. But let us look back now. Were we not perhaps too unaccustomed to the bitter gall of defeat, too unnerved by the steady succession of bad news, to see the whole picture clearly?

There had been naval wars ever since the battle of Salamis saved ancient Greece; but there was no precedent for naval war on the scale we faced after Pearl Harbor. The average American was incapable of understanding the tremendous job which the Navy faced. This was

global war—a new concept. To win complete control of every foot of every sea the world around, and to control as well every foot of skies above those seas—this was the Navy's responsibility. At the same time, of course, it was the Army's job to fight the war on every continent of the world; but it was the Navy's responsibility to see that every man and every scrap of material destined to all the continents landed safely, and to maintain huge and constant streams of supplies to American outposts the world around; to build up new bases from trackless jungle to full operating efficiency; to design and rush the construction of new ships by the hundreds; to supervise the manufacture of all the guns and equipment that go on them; to recruit and train 30,000 pilots and hundreds of thousands of officers and seamen each year; and to protect every foot of the 16,000 miles of coastline of the United States and her possessions—these, too, were the Navy's responsibilities.

It was indeed a task without precedent in the history of war. All this incredible mass of world-straddling strategy and hectic detail had to be directed from that rambling, crumbling, white structure down on Constitution Avenue. No wonder the Navy leaders accepted the Nation's criticisms in grim silence. They were busy.

In a war only one thing counts—results. Let us see how well the Navy has done its gigantic, hydra-headed job.

The acid test of any Navy is in actual combatant engagements. We have seen plenty of them in this war. Count them off. Mark them up on the scoreboard of history.

Pearl Harbor: A stunning, crushing blow which failed in its prime purpose, which was to cripple forever our Pacific sea power, but which nevertheless must be classed as a tragic defeat.

Macassar Straits: A surprise sortie in which a daring force of United States destroyers cut into a huge Japanese convoy, sinking five transports and throwing the escorting warships into complete confusion before they dashed away unscathed.

The Gilbert and Marshall Islands raids: Surprise blows of reprisal for Pearl Harbor, brilliantly conceived and executed.

The Java Sea: Hopelessly outnumbered at sea and devoid of air protection, we fought gallantly to an eventual defeat.

The Coral Sea: Although we lost the *Lexington*, this 5-day battle was the first major set-back of the Japanese in their march of aggression in the South Pacific. We sank or crippled no less than 20 Japanese ships. A victory that set the Japs back 2 months in their anticipated assault against Australia.

Midway: The most significant, the most glorious triumph of the war in the Pacific. Four Japanese carriers sunk, with at least 275 planes destroyed, together with their crews. Two or 3 battleships damaged, 1 severely. Two cruisers sunk, and 4 more damaged. Three, and possibly 4, destroyers sunk. A blow from which Japan will never fully recover.

The Solomons: The battle for the Solomons marks the beginning of the offensive in the Pacific. The initial cost to



us was three cruisers, but the way was decisively opened to regaining all that has been lost since December 7. The loss of the *Astoria*, *Vincennes*, and *Quincy* was avenged on October 10 when the Japs lost one heavy cruiser, four destroyers, and one transport in this area.

These have been the major fighting engagements, not counting individual sinkings by our submarines and motor torpedo boats. The score is five spectacular successes to two set-backs; five great victories, three of them crippling to the enemy, as against two defeats. This in an ocean in which we are supposedly outclassed by the enemy, and after the enemy had "destroyed" our Pacific Fleet!

What was the secret? It lies not alone in the bravery and fighting skill of our officers and men, inspiring though that bravery and skill undoubtedly were, but also in the foresightedness of our Navy planners in building a balanced Navy. The Navy always knew it might have to fight any kind of naval war, and probably every kind of naval war at once. As a consequence, the Navy never concentrated on one type of ship at the expense of another. We built up all phases of our fleet at once—battleships, aircraft carriers, planes, light and heavy cruisers, and destroyers—and at the same time we did not forget the submarine chasers and the patrol craft for home waters.

True, the naval planners were preparing for a war of fleets, which had been the pattern before December 7; but the balanced Navy which they built has made it possible to organize the tight, fast, hard-hitting task forces which staged the Gilbert and Marshall raids, and met the Japs in the Coral Sea, off Midway Island, and in the Solomons.

We were quick to learn; and are today prepared to employ the new tactics to their fullest and most deadly effectiveness against our enemies. Eleven carriers were building when Pearl Harbor was attacked; and the recent naval appropriations bills initiated more of them, in numbers never conceived by Germany and Japan. Yes, we are watching our Nation's future, now being decided upon the high seas, and can be reverently thankful for the foresightedness which made our Navy a balanced weapon.

Put what of the Navy's other jobs? What of her convoys, for example? American troops stand poised in Ireland and England ready to lunge at the European continent as soon as guns and planes enough are massed. American troops hold the bleak tundras of Iceland. American troops tramp the streets of Melbourne, man the antiaircraft guns at Suez, fly planes in China, and patrol the icy coasts of the Aleutians. They are in tanks and planes in North Africa, and South Africa is becoming familiar with the Yanks. To all these fighting men, wherever they may be, must go an uninterrupted stream of materials for war—guns, tanks, and planes, warm clothing, medical supplies, and good red meat, mail, mortars, and motor trucks. These and all the other multitudinous military supplies, together with reinforcements and replacements of the men themselves, must get through.

To see that they do get through is the Navy's least spectacular but perhaps its

most important single task. Its immensity is staggering. The distance from New York to Iceland is 3,000 storm-swept miles, plus 3,000 more for the return trip. Between here and Ireland, where the largest convoys in American history have already landed, are 3,300 miles of periscope-pocked ocean. The tortuous route to Russia covers more than 5,000 stormy miles. Australia is 7,700 miles from San Francisco, and at least 11,000 from New York. India, where enormous United States forces have arrived, is well over 10,000 miles away via the Cape of Good Hope.

Add to these distances the trips to Hawaii, to Samoa, and to the Aleutians, and we get some idea of the tens of thousands of miles of supply lines which must be kept open at all times if we are to win this war. In the last war the supply lines which were the Navy's responsibility were only about 3,300 miles long. Today they are nearly 80,000 miles in length. This is global war.

Are the supply lines being kept open? Witness that as I speak here today, an incredibly small number of men and a very small amount of material have been lost on troop convoy. Maintaining a ceaseless, monotonous, nerve-wracking vigil on the sea and over it, in all kinds of weather and at all seasons of the year, the Navy gets them through.

What is going on at home? It is no secret to the American public that the U-boats scavenging along our coasts are the Navy's most pressing problem. Until now it has been a question of pushing through the arms and supplies going to our boys overseas or pulling our ships home to convoy intercoastal shipping. In the minds of the men who run this war, our boys on the battle fronts of the globe come first. Who could challenge their decision?

At this very moment the Navy is rushing to completion a vast fleet of submarine chasers and other patrol craft, numbering not scores but many hundreds—a mighty armada of sleek, speedy, deadly little vessels which will make the Axis wary of sending their abhorrent raiders within a thousand miles of our American shores.

On land the Navy is keeping pace with its jobs at sea. In every available shipyard of the land—not only along the coasts but even on the lakes and rivers inland—fighting ships are taking shape as fast as human ingenuity and energy can complete them. Naval inspectors keep a watchful eye over every critical engine part, gun barrel, and bag of powder which finds its way aboard any fighting ship. Plane plants are spewing forth planes—60,000 of them before the end of this year, 125,000 next year—to blast the minions of Hitler and Hirohito from the face of the earth. From one end of the country to the other naval training stations, naval air schools, and naval officer schools are turning out the best-trained fighting men in the world to make this equipment into weapons which will strike mighty blows for victory.

No one looking ahead today can predict the certainty of the progress of the struggle in which our Navy is now engaged. The battle is hard and treacherous al-

ways, but certain it is that final victory will be won. We can be sure that in these difficult days our Navy, wherever its operations extend, will carry out these operations with the gallantry and fighting spirit which are its traditions. We can be sure also that, however long and difficult the course to ultimate victory may be, our Navy will pursue it with vigor and intensity to the very end.

It may seem premature at the present time to look ahead to what our naval policy will be after the conclusion of this war. We can be sure, however, that the responsibilities of building a peaceful and stable world will rest most heavily upon the United States. In assuming those responsibilities our Navy will play a role of great importance as the guardian of a stable international system.

Under these circumstances it is well that we consider now the lessons to be learned from the recent history of our naval development, for when the time comes to apply these lessons after the war we shall be subjected to pressure from all sorts of interested groups, and in the resulting confusion we may lose sight of principles which today are clearly evident.

What are these lessons? Let me sum them up briefly as they appear to me:

First—and I assume no one will dispute this—we must recognize, once and for all, that unilateral disarmament is doomed to failure from the very start. The dream that if the peace-loving nations of the earth will discard their weapons the war-worshipping nations will automatically follow their example is a beautiful vision, but it is a false one.

It holds within it the germs of disaster. Think of the tragic situation in which our Navy would be if we alone had continued beyond 1932 the policy of disarming, which had by that time already wrought irretrievable damage to our naval forces. If we disarm in the future, let us be sure that everybody else disarms at the same time, and that we are not left out on the end of a limb by ourselves. The time may come when the human race will have reached such a point of perfection that the mere example of good intentions is enough to drive evil from the hearts of men. That day may some time come, but certainly it is a long way ahead of us now.

By the same token, let us remember that it is cheaper and better to replace our old ships at regular intervals as we go along, rather than have to do so hurriedly in time of crisis. The maintenance of building facilities and a skilled labor force is best done by spreading our peacetime building programs over a period of years.

Second, let us never again be deluded into believing that limitation of armaments alone is enough to insure peace. This is the error of mistaking the symptom for the disease. Armaments are but the symptom of international suspicion and jealousy, of the greed and selfish ambition of mankind. Jealousy, greed, and lust for power are the true breeding grounds of war. If we can solve the problem of correcting the passions of men, the question of armaments will settle itself.

Third, if we should engage in international limitation of armaments on a large scale, let us avoid the errors of previous pacts. Let us remember that disarmament, to be valid, must include all nations which are actual or potential naval powers. Let us avoid the error of limiting armaments on the basis of quality and class. Let us remember that it is useless to give power A and power B equality in destroyers in the belief that we are giving them equality in sea power. If power B build up a large submarine force and power A has long trade routes to protect, it is obvious that mere numerical equality actually results in considerable inferiority for power A.

Let us also avoid the error of trying to divide up the various branches of the armed forces and attempting to limit one without the other. There was a day when we could separate naval power, land power, and air power, but that day is gone forever. Today the three are inextricably entwined.

Finally, let us never again make the mistake of believing that any peaceful system can be set up without some basis of force behind it. There must be found some method of translating the will of peace-loving nations of the world into action to maintain that peace which they hold dear. Our Navy and those of the other democracies will inevitably play a considerable part in providing that necessary element of force. Let us keep our Navy well, healthy, and strong. Let us remember this difficult time and how it came to be. Let us make sure that the hard sacrifices of today are not frustrated by the blunders of tomorrow.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the following appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 13, 1942, at page 8102:

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO REPORT A BILL

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may be allowed to report an appropriation bill during the recess of the Senate, if it should recess over from today until a later day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I may or may not object. Of course, if consent is given, and the bill shall be reported, it can be brought up for consideration Thursday by motion, if we take a recess to Thursday at the conclusion of business today. At that time probably the report of the hearings will not be printed. If the bill were then laid before the Senate for immediate consideration, no opportunity would be given to study the bill and the hearings. I should join in the consent requested if it were provided that the bill should go over for 1 day, or until Monday, if Senators desire to have time to study it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that is perfectly reasonable.

Mr. McNARY. Then, with the understanding that the Senator may have permission to file the report, and upon the request of any Senator not familiar with the record or the bill, it may go over until the next session of the Senate, I shall not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. With that understanding, it is, without objection, so ordered.

It will be noted that the understanding was that if there were any objections to proceeding with the bill, it would go

over. The bill was reported in accordance with that understanding and agreement. The statement was:

It can be brought up for consideration Thursday by motion, if we take a recess to Thursday at the conclusion of business today.

Today, in accordance with that agreement, I brought up the bill by motion. I believe the Senator from Oregon was talking with some other Senator, or that his attention was otherwise engaged. The Vice President put the motion, and it was agreed to. I had no idea that that could possibly be a violation of the agreement. On the contrary, it was in the strictest accord with the agreement. Probably I should have called the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the motion, inasmuch as he had given a limited agreement to it; but the Senator was in his seat, and it never occurred to me that that should be done.

Later I asked unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which the motion was agreed to, and the bill is not now before the Senate.

Mr. President, I should like to set the record straight. The bill is of no more importance to me than it is to any other Senator. I happen to be acting for the committee, and I conceive it to be my duty to bring it before the Senate at the earliest possible time. In accordance with the understanding which was reached, there can be no possible objection to the bill going over until tomorrow if some Senator asks that it go over. So at this time I content myself with asking unanimous consent to proceed with the consideration of House bill 7672. Not for any consideration on earth would I be willing to violate any agreement which I made here or anywhere else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not care to hold an autopsy over what occurred earlier in the day. I am thoroughly conversant with the RECORD.

A high privilege is bestowed upon a Senator when he is permitted to file a report on a bill during a recess or adjournment of the Senate. Such a privilege should be scrupulously, cautiously, and fairly exercised. So long as I am minority leader I shall see that that is done.

I stated, on the page of the RECORD to which I have referred, that if any Senator objected the bill would go over. I had in mind then what I have in mind now, that when a bill is laid on the Vice President's desk for the consideration of the Senate it is accompanied by a report, which reflects only the amendments made by the Senate committee. There is no opportunity to explain the substance of the bill. The hearings are not before us, and we are not in a position properly to pass upon the bill or any amendments which the Senate committee may recommend.

I grant these privileges in order to cooperate and be helpful. At the same time, I respect the rule that every Senator should have an opportunity to legislate fairly. It is not good legislation for a committee to do all the legislating.

That is what occurs if bills are rushed through without Senators having an opportunity to read the hearings and study the bill and the report. Good legislation requires observance of the rules of the Senate.

I merely stated that if no objection were made, I should have no reason to insist that the bill go over. If the Senator had wanted to carry out literally the spirit of the statement which I made, he would have asked unanimous consent to consider the bill today. I did not intend to object. Let me say for the information of the Senator in charge of the bill that late last evening the bill was sent to my office. I took it home last evening and read it. I think I understand it. However, there was no supporting evidence in connection with any of the provisions in the House bill or the Senate committee amendments. However, I am willing to waive that and trust to the good judgment of the committee. But I do not want any Senator to rise and move for consideration of a bill when consideration should be on the basis of unanimous consent. That was the thought expressed by me the other day; and it is a thought which I am determined to impose on the Senate.

Mr. President, I play the game fairly. I am not saying that the Senator does not. Probably he did not have in mind the very essence of the high privilege which is granted to a Senator when he is permitted to go beyond the rule and file a report without any Senator having an opportunity to study the measure.

This measure may be a simple one. Probably I should not object. It provides appropriations of only \$6,000,000,000 or \$7,000,000,000. I may be criticized for wanting any deliberation or study of a measure of that kind.

I recall that some weeks ago—I believe it was in June—we had before us a measure providing appropriations of \$24,000,000,000. I asked that it go over for one day, and there was a flurry on the floor of the Senate. Probably I would have been impetuous if I have asked that it go over for 10 minutes, but I asked that it go over for a day.

This is a small bill, carrying appropriations of only \$6,000,000,000 or \$7,000,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. It carries more than \$9,000,000,000 of contractual authorizations, in addition to the \$6,000,000,000.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. It is a demand on the Treasury of the United States for a huge sum of money.

I think it is well to recall that the Finance Committee labored for about 2 months on the tax bill. It was before the Senate for a week, and we all worked desperately, earnestly, and seriously to pass a bill which would be fair and equitable to the taxpayers of the country. We think nothing of passing a bill in 15 minutes to spend all that and more. A Senator who asks for a moment's deliberation is put on the rack.

I shall express my feelings. If the Senator desires to have a certain bill taken up this afternoon, and if following



a roll call he requests unanimous consent that the bill be taken up, and if no other Senator objects, I shall not object, and the Senator can have the bill taken up.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, under those circumstances I shall suggest the absence of a quorum—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Tennessee to wait just a moment before doing so. If he will yield to me, let me say that I am quite satisfied that the Senator from Tennessee has no purpose to violate the spirit of the understanding which was had the other day when he asked permission to file his report. I think no one is more considerate and courteous than the Senator from Tennessee, and no one is more meticulous in keeping his agreements. I myself did not understand the other day that the bill would have to be brought up by unanimous consent. The Senator from Oregon said that if any Senator objected to its consideration today he would ask that it go over; and that was entirely agreeable. My thought was that the bill might be made the unfinished business, and then go over. That is a technical manner of bringing a bill before the Senate.

Personally, I am satisfied that no harm can be done by allowing the bill to go over. Unless there is some urgency about it, personally I should like to see it go over until Monday if it cannot be disposed of today; because the conferees on the tax bill are meeting every day from 10 o'clock until 5 o'clock, and the Senate conferees are interested in the bill and in one or two amendments which may be proposed to it. I do not know whether we can finish the tax bill in conference this week; but, unless there is some urgency in connection with the appropriation bill, it would be more convenient to let it go over until Monday.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say in answer to what the Senator has said that I myself do not think there is any such urgency. It never occurred to me that we wanted to hasten action on the bill any more than we usually do in the case of appropriation bills. Ordinarily, a great deal of debate does not occur on appropriation bills.

I suggest that we simply take up the bill and make it the unfinished business. In that event, Senators will have until Monday to go over the bill as much as they may care to do, and to examine it and scrutinize it as carefully as it is possible to do. Nothing has been put in the bill which the committee did not think proper to be included in it; but I want every Senator to be absolutely satisfied.

For that reason I suggest that I should like to have the Senate reach an agreement that the bill be taken up and be made the unfinished business, and then go over until Monday, so as to give every Senator an opportunity to consider it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee does not need any defense from the able Senator from Kentucky. I have made no charges. I think the Senator from Tennessee probably was suffering from a lapse of memory as to what occurred the other day. I was asserting my rights and the rights

of the Senate. I think the bill should go over until Monday. In the statement, indication was made that I thought the bill should go over until the next session of the Senate. I am willing to meet the situation fairly and to give every Senator an opportunity to study the hearings and the purposes and aims of the bill, and I should not object to making it the unfinished business, provided it does not come up until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that is the understanding I suggested.

Mr. McNARY. I understand that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is satisfactory to all Members of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 7672 be laid before the Senate, and that it not be discussed today, but be the unfinished business for Monday, and that we recess rather than adjourn today so that the bill may be taken up early on Monday.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7672) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

#### INTERPRETATION OF PROVISIONS OF PRICE CONTROL ACT AFFECTING AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at this time I wish to place before the Senate a matter which I believe to be of great importance. On October 2 this body acted upon a price-control bill. We passed the bill with certain amendments which were regarded as in the nature of compromise amendments and which were offered collectively by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I think the amendments were understood by every Senator. The bill went to conference. The report of the conference committee was made to the House and to the Senate, and was adopted by both Houses. The bill became law later that evening.

When the RECORD of that day's proceedings was published I looked through it, and was rather amazed to find in it two pages of remarks purported to have been made by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]. I did not recall having heard those remarks made upon the floor, and so I spoke to the Senator from Michigan about them. He advised me that he had asked leave to have the remarks printed, and expressed regret that they had been printed in such a way as to seem to have been delivered upon the floor.

I am sorry to say that these remarks are subject to an interpretation quite different from that made by most Members of the Senate. They also present an understanding quite different from that clearly held by the House Members of the conference committee.

I am reluctant to present this matter during the absence of the Senator from Michigan. I was told that he would be present this week, but evidently he has

been called home. Now I am told that probably he will not be back for 3 weeks.

In the meantime, the executive officers are apparently proceeding with the administration of the Price Control Act in accordance with the interpretation given it by the Senator from Michigan, an interpretation not presented on the floor of the Senate, but printed in the RECORD as a part of his remarks. The remarks will be found on pages 7722 and 7723 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are so much at variance with my own understanding of the bill and my own interpretation of it that at this time I should like to point out how they differ.

In the first place, in order that there be no mistake, I wish to say that on page 7722 the RECORD reads as follows:

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator from New Mexico very much for his statement.

Then the statement continues:

Mr. President, I wish to present a summary of the report.

I call attention to the fact that the summary is not a summary of the report of the conference committee, but is very plainly the Senator's own interpretation of the bill.

Two amendments were adopted by the Senate to the bill.

First, I should call attention to a paragraph appearing at the bottom of column 3 on page 7722 of the RECORD, in which the Senator from Michigan uses the following language in interpreting the two amendments adopted by the Senate. I quote from his statement:

Whenever price increases on any farm commodity since January 1, 1941, are more than offset by general increases in the costs of producing farm commodities, the bill therefore requires that the return to the grower shall be adjusted.

That is the interpretation given by the Senator from Michigan to the Reed-Tydings amendment.

The Reed-Tydings amendment to the Price Control Act reads as follows:

*Provided further,* That modifications shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, or where by reason of increased labor or other costs to the producers of such agricultural commodity incurred since January 1, 1941, the maximum prices so established will not reflect such increased costs.

Mr. President, I believe that this very clearly prohibits the payment of subsidies for farm commodities; but the interpretation as given by the Senator from Michigan reads:

Whenever price increases on any farm commodity since January 1, 1941, are more than offset by general increases in the costs of producing farm commodities, the bill therefore requires that the return to the grower shall be adjusted.

Thus implying that subsidies may be paid for agricultural production where the price is not permitted to reach parity.

I understand, too, Mr. President, that there are indications that the Price Ad-

ministration and the Department of Agriculture are going ahead with plans for paying wholesale subsidies for agricultural production. I read in the newspapers yesterday that subsidies will be paid for the production of milk in the New York milkshed and that other subsidies are likely to follow.

The other amendment which was adopted by the Senate is one which I prepared and which would have been offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] for himself and for me if the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] had not accepted and offered it. That amendment reads:

*Provided further, That in fixing price maximums for agricultural commodities and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, as provided for by this act, adequate weighting shall be given to farm labor.*

The interpretation given to that provision by the Senator from Michigan reads as follows:

Increased labor costs as reflected in rising wage rates for hired farm labor must be included in determining the extent of increased costs to growers.

That is not a correct interpretation of the amendment at all. It is not a correct interpretation of the amendment as presented to the House of Representatives by the chairman of the conference committee [Mr. STEAGALL]. I will now read the interpretation of that amendment as presented to the House. I was present in the House Chamber at the time and heard the matter presented by the gentleman from Alabama, Representative STEAGALL. The colloquy between the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is as follows:

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Does that contemplate that in doing so the President will allow the individual farmer to include his own wages? Or does that just mean the wages of the man he hires to work for him?

Mr. STEAGALL. As I understand this language, it was intended to embrace all farm labor. I do not see how anyone could contend that you could give adequate weighting to farm labor without considering all farm labor, and that provision relates to the price-fixing powers carried in this bill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. All right; as the gentleman understands it then, it includes the wages for the farmer who does his own work?

Mr. STEAGALL. Quite right.

I repeat, Mr. President, that the interpretation given by the Senator from Michigan in his remarks which were inserted, as he says, by permission to print, but which do not appear as such, was that—

Increased labor costs as reflected in rising wage rates for hired farm labor must be included.

These interpretations are very contradictory. I would not think of bringing this matter up now except it is apparent that by the time the Senator from Michigan returns, according to what I am told, this law will already have been put into effect by the executive departments of the Government.

I have been told since I have come on the floor that the price of potatoes has

been "frozen" at about 75 percent of parity. I have not seen the official order, and I do not know whether it is a temporary "freezing" or permanent "freezing," but, Mr. President, if any prices of farm commodities are being "frozen" at less than parity or if there is any general application to producers of farm commodities of subsidies which have not been heretofore authorized by law, then, I should say that the law is being applied in such a way as to constitute a clear violation not only of the letter of the law but certainly of the intent of the Congress as well.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have not had contact with the Senator from Vermont and I did not know what he had in his mind until now. What he has said does explain, however, some things which heretofore I have been unable to understand. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that when the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and I agreed upon what was known as the Tydings-Reed amendment we discussed, or I discussed, with the experts of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics the application of that amendment. The Senator from Maryland and I never had any thought, nor did the Bureau, that any other course would be taken than to add increased labor costs to the parity price. No question of a subsidy was ever considered either by the Senator from Maryland or by myself or anyone else, so far as I know.

I did not happen to be present in the Senate at the time the junior Senator from Michigan submitted his report, and, consequently, I was not aware, until I heard the Senator from Vermont today, just what the situation was.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that the two pages of comment or interpretation to which I have referred were the remarks which the Senator from Michigan told me he had obtained consent to have printed. I did not hear the request made, but I do not question that the Senator from Michigan made it. However, the statement appears in the Record as if it were a report rather than remarks which were inserted later on by unanimous consent.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the point with me is that I have had rather an active connection with the interpretation of this law. I was one of the Senators who day before yesterday prepared a letter to Mr. Henderson asking him how he "got that way" so far as the ceiling price on flour was concerned. At 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon the Kansas delegation from the House of Representatives, with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and myself had a talk with Mr. Byrnes. Later, about 5 o'clock in the afternoon, Mr. Byrnes told me that today there would come to me, as representing the group of 22 Members of Congress who signed the letter, a communication from Mr. Henderson. It was to be sent to me by special messenger this morning, but I have not as yet received it.

The disturbing thing is that all through this discussion and negotiation—if it may be called negotiation—there runs

the thread of a subsidy, and Mr. Henderson is apparently starting out on a subsidy policy. Where he cannot accomplish his purpose in any lawful way, he is going to subsidize.

I am violating no confidence when I state that I mentioned this matter yesterday in the discussion with Mr. Byrnes, and I told Mr. Byrnes that I did not agree with the wholesale subsidy policy which apparently Mr. Henderson intended to make absolutely the foundation of his administration of the act. If he does so, so far as I am concerned and so far as my understanding of the act is concerned, it is an absolute perversion of what the Senate intended.

Mr. President, I have been disturbed because when I have asked "How about that interpretation?" there has frequently been an intimation that the Price Administration was going to rely upon some mysterious sort of interpretation justifying the subsidy policy which I do not favor. Having had some little connection with the passage of the bill, and with getting the bill into its final shape, I wish to say that if these inferences and intimations are to be carried out, then we should immediately proceed to an amendment of the act, and put it in such language that it will be administered as the Congress of the United States intended, and not subject to the whim or the pet theory of some socialistic administrator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to say that my reason for bringing this matter up today, reluctantly, in the absence of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], was that a rather high official of the Department of Agriculture, who talked too much for somebody's good, was heard to say that under his—the Brown—interpretation, the executive agencies could fix the ceiling on farm products at 10 percent of parity, 90 percent, 100 percent, 110 percent, or 200 percent, just as they pleased. That is why I felt it imperative to bring the matter up today, in order to have the intent of the Members of the Congress made clear, because, on September 24, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] made this statement:

It is entirely possible that the dispute may have to be resolved by the third coordinate branch of the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, this is why I have felt it absolutely vital that the matter should be placed before the Senate without any further delay.

#### ADJUSTING ROYALTIES FOR THE USE OF INVENTIONS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Is there a bill now pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nothing is before the Senate at this time, the unfinished business having been temporarily laid aside by unanimous consent.

Mr. PEPPER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1693, Senate bill 2794, a bill reported



to the Senate by the Committee on Patents. This is a measure recommended by the War Department as an urgent matter. I should like to give a word of explanation of my reasons for making the motion.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator is making a motion?

Mr. PEPPER. I have made a motion.

Mr. McNARY. I think it would be better if the Senator would ask unanimous consent; otherwise he would displace the unfinished business.

Mr. PEPPER. The point the Senator raises was what led me to ask whether any bill was pending. In view of the situation, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate consider Calendar 1693, Senate bill 2794.

Mr. McNARY. I make no objection at this time. Let the Senator make his statement, at the conclusion of which I shall be better able to determine whether I shall make objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2794) to provide for adjusting royalties for the use of inventions for the benefit of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the War Department brought this matter to the attention of the Committee on Patents, and urged all reasonable and possible dispatch by the Congress in the disposition of the bill.

The proposal grows out of a situation in which the licensor of a patent has granted the use of the patent to a licensee upon a fixed royalty basis. The royalty might have been quite appropriate for ordinary peacetime purposes and for the number of uses that might have been made of the license by the licensee. However, since the beginning of the war, there have developed many instances of the Government having a contract with a licensee requiring the manufacture, for example, of possibly millions of units of the article which happened to be the subject of the license, and the payments under the royalty schedule, which might have been made the subject of a private contract between the licensor and the licensee, amounted to an excessive charge against the Government.

In other words, in such instances when the Government finds that the license fee being paid by the licensee to the licensor of a patent respecting an article being manufactured for or used by the Government, or at the Government's direction, in time of war, is excessive, the measure is designed to permit the Government to reduce the amount of royalty, and thereafter relieve the licensee of his contract to pay a higher royalty than that which may be directed and approved by the governmental agency. That is the essence of the bill.

Representatives of the War Department and the Navy Department appeared personally before the Committee on Patents, the committee considered the matter, and recommended to the Senate the passage of the bill.

I now see in the Chamber the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], who is a member of the Committee on Patents, and who has given a great deal of time and attention to the subject now before us. I think it would be desirable for him to make a statement to the Senate about the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I understand that a companion bill to the one being discussed is now before the Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives. Is that not so?

Mr. PEPPER. I think that is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator from Florida know whether or not hearings have been held on the House bill?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not recall whether any hearings have been held on the House bill. It was thought that final consideration of the subject would be expedited if the Senate found itself justified in acting on it, so that the House would have the benefit of the Senate's action.

Mr. DANAHER. As the Senator from Florida knows, I am in complete sympathy with the objectives of the bill, but I am led to believe that the House bill differs in several important particulars from the measure now before the Senate.

Substantial criticism has been expressed to me of our failure to provide in section 2 of the measure concurrent jurisdiction for the United States district courts to entertain suits in behalf of a licensor, at least to the extent to which jurisdiction is now conferred under the Tucker Act on the district courts, concurrently with the Court of Claims, in actions against the United States. I do not know that such a provision is necessary. I do know that the committee has discussed at some length the question whether or not it would recommend the inclusion of that particular thought.

However, since the House bill, as I am informed, is at serious variance with the Senate version in several particulars, it might be well to save the point, as it is obvious that a conference will be necessary in any event. Even though we pass the measure and let it go to the House in the form of the Senate bill, in which event, of course, the House will be at liberty to strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the House bill, it seems to me that we might save the point were we now to interpolate an amendment which would meet so much of the point with reference to concurrent jurisdiction as I have previously referred to.

Mr. PEPPER. I think it would be highly desirable if the able Senator from Connecticut would offer the amendment to which he has referred, and I am sure it would meet with the approval of both the committee and the Senate.

Mr. DANAHER. It well may be, let me say to the Senator from Florida, that if the House shares the feeling entertained by the committee hitherto, we can easily eliminate the provision, whereas if the House persists in what I understand to be its feeling on the point, we can retain it and still do no violence to the general purposes, objectives, and attainments of the bill.

Mr. President, with these thoughts I would respectfully move to amend—

Mr. PEPPER. Consent has not yet been given to consider the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. I beg the Senator's pardon. I understood that consent had been granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 2794?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in view of what has been stated, I have no objection. I have conferred with Senators, and have discussed the matter particularly with the able Senator from Connecticut, who is a member of the committee. In view of the general concurrence, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2794) to provide for adjusting royalties for the use of inventions for the benefit of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Patents with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the committee was, in section 1, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That," to insert a comma and the words "to aid in the successful prosecution of the war"; on line 4, after the word "invention", to strike out "described in and covered by a patent, or an application for a patent, of the United States", and to insert "whether patented or unpatented," so as to make the section read:

That, to aid in the successful prosecution of the war, whenever an invention, whether patented or unpatented, shall be manufactured, used, sold, or otherwise disposed of for the United States, with license from the owner thereof or anyone having the right to grant licenses thereunder, and such license includes provisions for the payment of royalties the rates or amounts of which are believed to be unreasonable or excessive by the head of the department or agency of the Government which has ordered such manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition, the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned shall give written notice of such fact to the licensor and to the licensee and in said notice, or within a reasonable time thereafter, shall by order fix and specify such rates or amounts of royalties, if any, as he shall determine are fair and just, taking into account the conditions of wartime production, and shall authorize the payment thereof by the licensee to the licensor on account of such manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition. Such licensee shall not thereafter pay to the licensor, nor charge directly or indirectly to the United States, a royalty, if any, in excess of that specified in said order on account of such manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition. The licensor shall not have any remedy by way of suit, set-off, or other legal action against the licensee for the payment of any additional royalty remaining unpaid, or damages for breach of contract or otherwise, but such licensor's sole and exclusive remedy, except as to the recovery of royalties fixed in said order, shall be as provided in section 2 hereof. Written notice as provided herein shall be mailed to the last known address of the licensor and licensee and shall be effective 2 days after the mailing thereof.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 3, line 17, before the word "disposition", to strike out "or" and to insert other;" on the same line, after the word "invention", to strike out "described in and covered by a patent or an application for a patent", and to insert "whether patented or unpatented, and", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. The head of any department or agency of the Government which has ordered the manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of an invention, whether patented or unpatented, and whether or not an order has been issued in connection therewith pursuant to section 1 hereof, is authorized and empowered to enter into an agreement, before suit against the United States has been instituted, with the owner or licensor of such invention, in full settlement and compromise of any claim against the United States accruing to such owner or licensor under the provisions of this act or any other law by reason of such manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition, and for compensation to be paid such owner or licensor based upon future manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of said invention.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, on page 4, line 10, after the word "paid", to strike out "by the Government" and to insert "directly or indirectly"; and on line 12, after the word "refund", to strike out "to the Government"; and on the same line, after the word "paid", to strike out "by it", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. Whenever a reduction in the rates or amounts of royalties is effected by order, pursuant to section 1 hereof, or by compromise or settlement, pursuant to section 3 hereof, such reduction shall inure to the benefit of the Government by way of a corresponding reduction in the contract price to be paid directly or indirectly for such manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of such invention, or by way of refund if already paid to the licensee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 13, to strike out section 5, section 6, and a part of section 7, as follows:

SEC. 5. The authority and discretion conferred by this act upon the head of any department or agency of the Government may be delegated in writing, in whole or in part, by such head to any subordinate individual, officer, board, or bureau in such department or agency, and such head may further authorize such individual, officer, board, or bureau to make such further delegation of such authority and discretion as may be found necessary.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this act and the act of June 25, 1910, as amended (40 Stat. 705; 35 U. S. C. 68), the manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of an invention described in and covered by a United States patent or in an application for patent therefor, by a contractor, a subcontractor, or any person, firm, or corporation for the Government and with the authorization or consent of the Government, shall be construed as manufacture, use, sale, or disposition for the United States.

SEC. 7. This act shall apply to all royalties, directly or indirectly chargeable to or payable by the United States for any supplies, equipment, or materials deliverable to the Government from and after the date of the approval hereof.

And to insert:

SEC. 5. The head of the department or agency of the Government concerned is fur-

ther authorized, in his discretion and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to delegate and provide for the redelegation of any power and authority conferred by this act to such responsible officers, boards, agents, or persons as he may designate or appoint.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this act, the manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of an invention, whether patented or unpatented, by a contractor, a subcontractor, or any person, firm, or corporation for the Government and with the authorization or consent of the Government shall be construed as manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition for the United States and for the purposes of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended (40 Stat. 705; 35 U. S. C. 68), the use or manufacture of an invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States by a contractor, a subcontractor, or any person, firm, or corporation for the Government and with the authorization or consent of the Government, shall be construed as use or manufacture for the United States.

SEC. 7. This act shall apply to all royalties directly or indirectly charged or chargeable to the United States for any supplies, equipment, or materials to be delivered to or for the Government from and after the effective date of this act. This act shall also apply to all royalties charged or chargeable directly or indirectly to the United States for supplies, equipment, or materials already delivered to or for the Government which royalties have not been paid to the licensor prior to the effective date of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, page 6, line 19, after the word "termination", to strike out the word "hereof" and insert the word "thereof", so as to read:

Sections 1 and 2 of this act shall remain in force only during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination thereof, except that as to rights accrued or liabilities incurred prior to termination thereof, the provisions of this act shall be treated as remaining in force and effect for the purpose of sustaining, qualifying, or defeating any suit or claim hereunder.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 8, on page 7, line 6, after the words "licensee of", to strike out "a patent or patent application covering"; and on page 7, line 7, after the word "invention", to insert "whether patented or unpatented", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 8. The head of each department or agency of the Government may issue such rules and regulations and require such information as may be necessary and proper to carry out the provisions of this act. The provisions of section 10 (1) of an act approved July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 787), as amended, and title XIII of Public Law 507, Seventy-seventh Congress, shall be applicable to the owner, licensor, or licensee of an invention, whether patented or unpatented, manufactured, used, sold, or otherwise disposed of for the United States, and the term "defense contract" as used in said act shall mean and include an agreement for the payment of royalty, regardless of its date, under or by virtue of which royalty is directly or indirectly paid by the Government or included within the contract price for property sold to or manufactured for the Government.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 14, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 9. Nothing herein contained shall be deemed to preclude the applicability of section 403 of Public Law 528, Seventy-seventh Congress, as the same may be heretofore or hereafter amended so far as the same may be found applicable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 19, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 10. If any provision of this act or the application of any provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, or if any provision of this act shall be inoperative by its terms, the validity or applicability of the remainder of the act, and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

MR. DANAHER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 3, in line 5, after the word "Claims" to insert a comma and the words: "or in the district courts of the United States insofar as such courts may have concurrent jurisdiction with the Court of Claims."

MR. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thoroughly concur in the amendment the able Senator from Connecticut has offered. It merely gives the district courts concurrent jurisdiction with the Court of Claims in these cases. I think the amendment would be helpful in working out this matter with the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [MR. DANAHER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read a third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for adjusting royalties for the use of inventions for the benefit of the United States, in aid of the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes."

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

MR. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Overton in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

MR. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Calendar.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

#### IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John L. Hall, Jr., to be rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from June 14, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, October 19, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 15, 1942:

##### UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named dental surgeon to be senior dental surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite his name:

Henry T. Dean, October 5, 1942.

##### TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

###### TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERALS

Maj. Gen. Robert Lawrence Elchelberger (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. George Churchill Kenney (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

###### TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Neal Creighton Johnson (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

##### APPOINTMENT, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE NAVY

Capt. Oliver M. Read to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 9th day of May 1942.

#### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

##### ALABAMA

Ollis O. Goode, Rogersville, Ala., in place of O. O. Goode. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Marguerite Noles Skinner, Thomaston, Ala., in place of M. C. Mosley, declined.

##### ALASKA

Hollis Henrichs, Cordova, Alaska, in place of O. H. Kulper, removed.

##### ARKANSAS

Herbert D. Russell, Conway, Ark., in place of H. D. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lillie Q. Lowe, Gillett, Ark., in place of L. Q. Lowe. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charlie O. Sawyer, Hamburg, Ark., in place of C. O. Sawyer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hugh Murphy, Huntsville, Ark., in place of A. L. Coger, transferred.

Fred M. Johnson, Huttig, Ark., in place of F. M. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Myrt Walrond, Pocahtontas, Ark., in place of Myrt Walrond. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Paul Janes, Ravenden, Ark., in place of Paul Janes. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Donald W. Hall, West Memphis, Ark., in place of M. B. Cooper, resigned.

##### CALIFORNIA

Mary Ella Dow, Anderson, Calif., in place of M. E. Dow. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frederick A. Dickinson, Ben Lomond, Calif., in place of F. A. Dickinson. Incumbent's commission expired May 27, 1942.

John G. Carroll, Calexico, Calif., in place of J. G. Carroll. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Harry B. Hooper, Capitola, Calif., in place of H. B. Hooper. Incumbent's commission expired May 27, 1942.

Harold E. Rogers, Chowchilla, Calif., in place of H. E. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1942.

Frank J. Roche, Concord, Calif., in place of F. J. Roche. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Alice D. Scanlon, Colfax, Calif., in place of A. D. Scanlon. Incumbent's commission expired May 27, 1942.

Robert A. Clothier, Cotati, Calif., in place of R. A. Clothier. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1942.

L. Belle Morgan, Encanto, Calif., in place of L. B. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Faith I. Wyckoff, Firebaugh, Calif., in place of F. I. Wyckoff. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary B. Bradford, Galt, Calif., in place of M. B. Bradford. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Ralph W. Dunham, Greenfield, Calif., in place of R. W. Dunham. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1942.

Frederick N. Blanchard, Laton, Calif., in place of F. N. Blanchard. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Bert A. Wilson, Los Banos, Calif., in place of B. A. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired June 14, 1942.

##### COLORADO

William J. Murphy, Breckenridge, Colo., in place of W. J. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1942.

Harold W. Riffe, Eckley, Colo., in place of H. W. Riffe. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William H. Rhoades, Jr., Kit Carson, Colo., in place of W. H. Rhoades, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

James A. Collins, Minturn, Colo., in place of J. A. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

##### CONNECTICUT

Edward M. Doyle, Bantam, Conn., in place of E. M. Doyle. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ralph W. Bull, Kent, Conn., in place of R. W. Bull. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Elizabeth J. Carris, Stepney Depot, Conn., in place of E. J. Carris. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

##### FLORIDA

Harold G. Hull, Groveland, Fla., in place of H. G. Hull. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Emma S. Fletcher, Havana, Fla., in place of E. S. Fletcher. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

William P. McKeown, Sneads, Fla., in place of W. P. McKeown. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

##### GEORGIA

George B. McIntyre, Ailey, Ga., in place of G. B. McIntyre. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William H. Wood, Jr., Loganville, Ga., in place of W. H. Wood, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1942.

Hugh L. Johnston, Woodstock, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

##### IDAHO

Thomas B. Hargis, Ashton, Idaho., in place of T. B. Hargis. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

##### ILLINOIS

Emma J. Zinschlag, Beckemeyer, Illinois., in place of E. J. Zinschlag. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Vernard Dale Snyder, Bethany, Ill., in place of V. D. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1942.

Ruth M. McElvain, Broughton, Ill., in place of R. M. McElvain. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Elbert McDonald, Carriers Mills, Ill., in place of Elbert McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired May 11, 1942.

Joseph I. Kvidera, Cary, Ill., in place of J. I. Kvidera. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clason W. Black, Clay City, Ill., in place of C. W. Black. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Fred A. McCarty, Edinburg, Ill., in place of F. A. McCarty. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Edmund J. Coveny, Elisabeth, Ill., in place of E. J. Coveny. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Beryl J. Donaldson, Farina, Ill., in place of B. J. Donaldson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clyde E. Wilson, Melvin, Ill., in place of C. E. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hazel E. Davis, Minier, Ill., in place of H. E. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Nellie Waters, Murrayville, Ill., in place of Nellie Waters. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Henry B. Shroyer, New Windsor, Ill., in place of H. B. Shroyer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clarence M. Stevens, Pecatonica, Ill., in place of C. M. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Marguerite A. Lamb, Port Byron, Ill., in place of M. A. Lamb. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

James Doherty, Ridgway, Ill., in place of James Doherty. Incumbent's commission expired May 11, 1942.

Joseph L. Molitor, Round Lake, Ill., in place of J. L. Molitor. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ross St. Clair Tary, Seaton, Ill., in place of R. St. C. Tary. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Alfred J. Geiseman, Shannon, Ill., in place of A. J. Geiseman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rose S. Zalman, Stewardson, Ill., in place of R. S. Zalman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frances T. Johnson, Yates City, Ill., in place of F. T. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## INDIANA

George H. Clarkson, Morocco, Ind., in place of G. H. Clarkson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clarence C. Robertson, Nashville, Ind., in place of C. C. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Cora Riley, Oaklandon, Ind., in place of Cora Riley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William N. Burns, Otterbein, Ind., in place of W. N. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

James C. Talbott, Veterans' Administration Hospital, Ind., in place of J. C. Talbott. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles Lebo, Winamac, Ind., in place of Charles Lebo. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1942.

Louis F. Fuelling, Woodburn, Ind., in place of L. F. Fuelling. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## IOWA

Vestie L. O'Connor, Graettinger, Iowa, in place of V. L. O'Connor. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## KANSAS

Harriet Pearl Hinshaw, Arlington, Kans., in place of Olga Warner. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1941.

Sophia Kesselring, Atwood, Kans., in place of Sophia Kesselring. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles Ward Smull, Bird City, Kans., in place of C. W. Smull. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Jane Waters, Bonner Springs, Kans., in place of Jane Waters. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles A. Hegarty, Effingham, Kans., in place of C. A. Hegarty. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Page Manley, Elk City, Kans., in place of Page Manley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Walter S. Davis, Florence, Kans., in place of W. S. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rosa J. Munger, Hanover, Kans., in place of R. J. Munger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Warren D. Gilmore, Highland, Kans., in place of W. D. Gilmore. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ivan R. Mort, Hill City, Kans., in place of I. R. Mort. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William A. B. Murray, Holyrood, Kans., in place of W. A. B. Murray. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Robert E. Deveney, Meriden, Kans., in place of R. E. Deveney. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Grace E. Wilson, Milford, Kans., in place of G. E. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Eunice E. Buche, Miltonvale, Kans., in place of E. E. Buche. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Perry S. Kozel, Morrowville, Kans., in place of P. S. Kozel. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Edison Brack, Otis, Kans., in place of Edison Brack. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lawrence W. Leisure, Pleasanton, Kans., in place of L. W. Leisure. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ralph L. Hinnen, Potwin, Kans., in place of R. L. Hinnen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George J. Smith, Summerfield, Kans., in place of G. J. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## KENTUCKY

Nora Dixon McGee, Burkesville, Ky., in place of N. D. McGee. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John A. Van Pelt, Kenvir, Ky., in place of J. A. Van Pelt. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William L. Dawson, Jr., La Grange, Ky., in place of J. J. Sheehan, resigned.

Watson G. Holbrook, Whitesburg, Ky., in place of W. G. Holbrook. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## LOUISIANA

Sylvester J. Folse, Patterson, La., in place of S. J. Folse. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

## MAINE

George H. Foster, Unity, Maine, in place of G. H. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## MICHIGAN

Kenneth L. Martin, Bloomfield Hills, Mich., in place of M. M. Martin, resigned.

Frank J. Nothelfer, Hemlock, Mich., in place of F. J. Nothelfer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## MINNESOTA

Benjamin F. DuBois, Jr., Sauk Centre, Minn., in place of B. F. DuBois, resigned.

## MISSOURI

Glendon H. Yahn, Weldon Spring, Mo. Office became Presidential October 1, 1941.

## OHIO

Charles R. Gampher, Jr., Rossford, Ohio, in place of C. R. Gampher, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Ralph M. Bard, Kutztown, Pa., in place of Llewellyn Angstadt, retired.

Joseph F. Conrad, Scranton, Pa., in place of J. F. Conrad. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## TEXAS

Marguerite A. Mullen, Alice, Tex., in place of M. A. Mullen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## WISCONSIN

Matthew J. Hart, Glidden, Wis., in place of M. J. Hart. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1942.

Robert J. Relland, Port Edwards, Wis., in place of C. N. Akey, removed.

Irene R. Sprangers, Waldo, Wis., in place of W. H. Sprangers, retired.

## WYOMING

Bessie Adkins, Medicine Bow, Wyo., in place of M. L. Cooper, resigned.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 15, 1942:

## IN THE NAVY

## TEMPORARY SERVICE

John L. Hall, Jr., to be a rear admiral, for temporary service in the Navy, to rank from June 14, 1942.

## POSTMASTERS

## ILLINOIS

John G. Rehwald, Altamont.  
Charles G. Sowell, Granite City.

## MARYLAND

James F. Stack, Ridgely.

## TEXAS

Milton L. Burleson, El Paso.  
Mollie S. Berryman, Willis.

## UTAH

D. Grant Ingersoll, American Fork.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we pray that the remembrance of Thee may fill our thoughts with all that is most beautiful and full of promise. When we thus forget the blinding flashes of a world convulsed in the throes of misery and degradation and turn to Thee, Thou art a holy benediction of strength and encouragement. The upward look gives majesty to our earthward steps and our prayers are gathered up into the harmonies of peace and brotherly love. O Divine Spirit, be ours in purpose and in purity of thought and in the varied services we may render our fellow men.

We are grateful for the Teacher of Nazareth whose words are the richest and sweetest utterances which ever fell upon this sorrowing world. Thou didst go about doing good and in Thy daily service, on missions of mercy, reveal the heart of an infinitely holy God. O Thou Ancient of Days, Oh, that men everywhere would surrender to the outstretched arms of a pitying Father whose mercy endureth forever. We pray Thee to keep alive in all hearts the highest and dearest aspirations of mankind and Thine shall be the praise. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 15, 1942.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. RAYBURN: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and request that the same be accepted forthwith.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR D. MILLS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

## ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

MR. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic caucus, I present a resolution (H. Res. 552) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 552) as follows:

*Resolved*, That WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE SENATE AMENDMENTS NUMBERED PRINT OF THE BILL (H. R. 7378) TO PROVIDE REVENUE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

MR. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 33 authorizing the printing of



additional copies of the Senate amendments numbered print of the bill (H. R. 7378) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, and request immediate consideration thereof.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed 3,500 additional copies of the Senate amendments numbered print of the bill (H. R. 7378) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room, 1,000 copies for the use of the House document room, 500 copies for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.*

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN]?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. FULMER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. HOFFMAN, may extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### THE PRICE CONTROL ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. WOLCOTT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### THE NEW REPUBLIC AND UNION FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a complete list of the Communist affiliations of the editors of the New Republic.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Is it proper for me at this time to ask permission to address the House for another minute on a subject which affects many Members of this Congress, which is con-

tained in the book "The Illustrious Dunderhead?"

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think he should recognize the gentleman at this time to proceed for 1 minute until he recognizes other Members.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. If the gentleman from New Jersey is mentioned in this publication in a derogatory way, would he not have the right to rise to a question of personal privilege and be recognized for 1 hour?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman would if he had raised a question of constitutional privilege. The gentleman does not seem to desire that.

#### EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN LANDS FROM CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, by authority of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5503), to authorize the Attorney General to stipulate to the exclusion of certain property from condemnation proceedings, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5503) entitled "An act to authorize the Attorney General to stipulate to the exclusion of certain property from condemnation proceedings," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its first amendment.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the second amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,  
EMANUEL CELLER,  
EARL C. MICHENER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

PAT MCCARRAN,  
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,  
G. W. NORRIS,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5503) entitled "An act to authorize the Attorney General to stipulate to the exclusion of certain property from condemnation proceedings," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon in conference, and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill permits the Attorney General to agree or stipulate on behalf of the United States in any condemnation proceedings to exclude any property or interests therein that may have been taken by the United States as a result of a declaration of taking or otherwise.

The first Senate amendment has the effect of requiring the Attorney General to secure the consent of the department or agency affected before entering into such a stipula-

tion as authorized by the bill. The Senate recedes from this amendment.

The second Senate amendment makes the authority granted to the Attorney General by the proposed legislation applicable to future condemnation proceedings, as well as to those already instituted. The House agrees to this amendment.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,  
EMANUEL CELLER,  
EARL C. MICHENER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SCRAP COLLECTION

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that the various salvage campaigns throughout the country have been only partially successful, that but a very small percentage of the available scrap has been obtained. As an example of a campaign that is being properly and expertly handled, I wish to submit the record made by my home county; since the salvage campaign began, Wichita County, Tex., has made an outstanding record. The salvage committee of this county, headed by the Honorable Jerry Vinson, has gathered to date over 54,000,000 pounds of scrap, an average of 740 pounds per person in that small county, and they have only begun. For 3 weeks 30 keymen devoted their full time to this campaign. This committee used 400 trucks and drivers and 3,000 men on these trucks; they further used 15,000 school children, 900 air-raid wardens, 1,200 hobby helpers, 2,800 Victory farmers, 12 paid watchmen and handlers, 5 paid office workers, 4 telephone lines, and 4 offices were kept busy, and over 250,000 man-hours devoted to this service. This is some record for a county of slightly over 70,000 population. Let other counties compare their record with this. Splendid organization and patriotic, hard work got the job done. Congratulations to Wichita County, Tex.

#### COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS— LOWERING OF INDUCTION AGE OF DRAFTEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on legislation pending before the committee relating to the lowering of the induction age of draftees.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### WAR PROBLEMS OF THE FARMER

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENNINGS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

# PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the regular business of the day has been disposed of, and following any previous special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement that Mr. Beardsley Ruml has made regarding taxation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from a speech made by Robert Nelson Anderson, president of the Federal Bar Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter written by the Honorable Thomas Riggs, former Governor of Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## STABILIZING RENTS ON REAL PROPERTY

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7695) to aid in preventing inflation, to stabilize the rents of real property, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand it is the intention of the gentleman from Alabama that if this unanimous consent is granted to consider the bill the bill will be open for amendment and the Members may be recognized under the 5-minute rule. Is that correct?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does the bill do?

Mr. STEAGALL. The bill reaffirms a provision of the original Price Control Act which authorized the control of rents and the regulation of rental charges in defense areas when so proclaimed by the President, and specifically in the District of Columbia, regardless of whether the District of Columbia should be declared a defense area. In the recent amendments of the Price Control Act authority was given the President to prevent inflation, to control the cost of living, and to stabilize prices, wages, and salaries. Following the passage of the last amendment to the Price Control Act the President issued an order in which he exercised the powers conferred under this bill with respect to the regulation and stabilization of rents.

This bill now before us applies to rents of commercial and residential properties, hotels, and rooming houses in the various States, Territories, and in the District of Columbia.

Mr. RICH. In other words, it is just an effort to perfect the bill that has already been passed with certain clarifications. Does it do anything that is entirely foreign to the other bill?

Mr. STEAGALL. It does not.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman mentioned in discussing the provisions of the bill that it included the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is quite right.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have no reason to object to the unanimous-consent request, and shall not, but I want it clearly understood by the membership of the House that some 6 months prior to the setting up of the rent control by O. P. A. in the defense areas of the country we passed a bill providing such control in the District of Columbia. The people of the District have confidence in the administration of the Emergency Rent Act of the District of Columbia. I presume there is nothing in the bill touching the District of Columbia which would require the scrapping of the present organization. Will the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is quite true; but may I say to the gentleman that the original price-control bill provided authority for the Price Administrator to regulate rents in all defense areas throughout the country which had been proclaimed defense areas by order of the President and, in addition to that and without regard to whether the District of Columbia should be declared a defense area by the President, the District of Columbia was included in that authority conferred upon the Price Administrator. For some reason the Price Administrator has not exercised that authority down to this time.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman does not attempt to commit the House to the policy that we will continue or not continue any existing agency in the District of Columbia, since that question was not considered or passed upon by the committee in this bill?

Mr. STEAGALL. No. What we are attempting to do is to extend the powers of the President to control inflation and the cost of living and to apply to rents throughout the United States, whether in defense areas or not, including the District of Columbia.

Mr. PATMAN. We are not passing on any existing agency?

Mr. STEAGALL. And to include hotels and rooming houses, both as to rents and rates. We are not dealing with any other matter.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is not my desire, nor the desire of members of the District of Columbia Committee or the Members of this House, many of whom have spoken to me, to halt the consideration of this legislation in an orderly fashion. In other words, I am energetic in attempting to bring about its national passage, but I do believe there is a tendency, which we all recognize, of an organization reaching out to take control of every

single step in the procedure, and after we have established worth-while organizations which are functioning with a minimum of cost and with a maximum of efficiency we do not want to wreck that program, and I know the gentleman does not want to do that.

Mr. STEAGALL. The authority would be utilized in connection with any other authority, local or in the original Price-Control Act. The Administrator of that act is specifically authorized to consult and confer with any local or State authority, to take notice of State requirements—that is one of the requirements of the law—before putting an order into effect, but the provisions of this bill would apply, just as I have indicated, everywhere in the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to make an observation on what the gentleman from West Virginia has stated. Of course, the bill would permit this but the natural presumption is that with an efficient local organization established as a result of the legislation passed, which came out of the gentleman's committee, it is fair to assume that such local working organization will be utilized or permitted to carry on. We have Mr. Paul Porter, who is a very wonderful administrator. I have nothing but admiration for him, never having met him.

Mr. PATMAN. But there is nothing in this bill that commits this House to any particular policy, for any local agency or against any local agency. We just do not pass on that question.

Mr. STEAGALL. On the contrary, this bill confers over-all authority upon the President of the United States to deal with the situation throughout the United States, and includes other charges that may not be technically called rents for the use of real property.

Mr. RICH. The authority was given the President under the price-control bill for the regulation of the price of labor, farm commodities, and practically everything else. Now, the gentleman has heard the statements made on the floor this morning in various speeches about labor leaving the farms and the difficulty the farmers are having to work their farms. I notice a very serious matter in connection with the farmers of my district. Some of them are thinking of selling their cattle because they cannot get help. There is one thing that should be impressed on the Chief Executive, and that is that unless he regulates the price of labor so that farm labor can be kept on the farm, we are going to have a difficult time feeding the people of this country, because these laborers will leave the farms. This is a serious situation and I hope the gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, will bring it to the attention of the President and do it mighty quick because it is a serious thing.

Mr. STEAGALL. I think everybody recognizes that.

Mr. BOREN. Will the gentleman yield?



Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. I want to ask what objection was found to fixing a day for setting these ceilings; for instance, some day prior to the time these rises began?

Mr. STEAGALL. The language of the original bill provided that as far as practicable this stabilization control should be based upon rent charges as of the 15th day of September 1942. It was thought by the committee, however, that some elasticity should be allowed at that point rather than to tie the administrator to a specific date for the reason that naturally there will be instances where these charges have been raised unduly and where it would be desirable to adjust them and to give such elasticity as would permit an equitable administration of the act rather than tie the Administration to a definite date.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to get the gentleman's opinion on this matter, while it has not been discussed in the committee: Is it the opinion of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency that this bill prevents the Federal Government from going to property owners here in the District and offering step-ups in the rent payment in order to acquire space from some present occupant? In other words, I want to get the gentleman's opinion as to whether or not this bill will prevent the Federal Government from causing rents to move upward through that kind of approach.

Mr. STEAGALL. Of course, the purpose of the bill is to prevent raises in rents.

Mr. CRAWFORD. One other matter on which I would like to get an expression from the gentleman more than an opinion. Is it not the gentleman's opinion that the Administrator, say, Administrator Byrnes, will use his usual good judgment in dealing with whatever problem there might be involved on account of the District Rent Control Commission now being in operation and perhaps being brought in under this bill?

Mr. STEAGALL. Assuredly so. Let me say in that connection that I think it is reassuring to the Members of the House and to the congressional branch of the Government that Mr. Justice Byrnes has been put in a position of responsibility with respect to the administration of these acts designed to accomplish economic stabilization.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. STEAGALL. I share the gentleman's view that we may well trust him for fair and proper administration of this act.

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I concur in what the gentleman said about the rent administrator, Mr. Byrnes, but I notice this bill includes commercial rents.

Mr. STEAGALL. It does.

Mr. MICHENER. Let us consider a case like this. There are throughout the country numerous commercial leases where an individual or a company, for

instance, leases a building in possibly the most important commercial part of a city to a company or to an individual to carry on a retail business. The lease covers a period of let us say 40 years. The lease provides a minimum of let us say \$10 a month rent, plus a percentage of the profits realized out of the mercantile or retail business during the life of the lease. Therefore, the lessee in a way becomes a silent partner in the venture. Will the provision in the general O. P. A. Act, referring to equities, protect that silent partner against the possible minimum rate named in the lease?

Mr. STEAGALL. I am sure that under a fair administration of the law, such as we have every reason to anticipate, that situation would be dealt with justly and properly.

Mr. MICHENER. I think the gentleman gets what I mean.

Mr. STEAGALL. I do.

Mr. MICHENER. If I want to help a friend and I buy a commercial block and lease that man the block for \$1 a month plus an agreed percentage of the profits and is therefore paying a fair and equitable rent on this percentage basis, am I to be deprived of the percentage part of the rent?

Mr. STEAGALL. As I said, I am sure we could trust the Administrator to administer the law at that point let me say, justly and fairly. In that connection, it would certainly be a case calling for great care on the part of the Administrator to see that no evasion was had of the purposes of the act.

Mr. GIFFORD. If the gentleman will yield, may I suggest to the gentleman from Michigan that we were assured, were we not, by Mr. Justice Byrnes yesterday that all contractual relations between lessor and lessee would be carried out and not disturbed, that no contract would be violated?

Mr. STEAGALL. Undoubtedly that would be the policy of the Administrator but, as I suggested, there might be cases where the matter of evasion would call for careful inquiry and caution.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, reporting this bill, answers directly the question I asked. Those leases to which I referred are legal contracts made in good faith and not in contemplation of a rent-control act.

One more thing: We over here could not hear the gentleman's unanimous-consent request. Was it that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, that general debate be dispensed with, and that we proceed at once to read the bill under the 5-minute rule for amendment under the general rules of the House?

Mr. STEAGALL. That was the inquiry made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] to which I responded in the affirmative.

Mr. CELLER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that in my humble experience of over 20 years in this House I have found that whenever as a result of public clamor and excitement we try to rush

a bill through as we did somewhat in our consideration of the price stabilization bill, we make mistakes, as is evidenced by the fact that we must now come back in the House and get some legislation with regard to control over rents.

I hope the House will not make the same mistake in the consideration of the amendment to the Selective Service Act regarding drafting 18- and 19-year-old men. They are rushing that bill through without adequately hearing both sides, all sides, and I predict that if they do that we will come back here again asking for amendments, just as amendments are being asked for now on the price-stabilization bill. I do hope those in charge of the bill will give everybody an opportunity to be heard on the proposition of the 18- and 19-year-old men being drafted into the Army.

Mr. STEAGALL. I may say to my friend, the gentleman from New York, that the matter now under consideration has been under study for months, and that if any matter has ever come before the House after due consideration, the proposal before us today is such a matter.

Mr. PATRICK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I am getting a tremendous number of letters from my district in Birmingham, Ala.—I even got some today—in which the writers contend that during the months this situation has been so acute they rented their property at a price below what they can afford to rent it for, and even lost money on it. In some cases that was done to keep the property from being boarded up and left vacant, to keep them from being abandoned, when perhaps the windows would be knocked out or other damage done. They now contend that the position we are in now leaves them in the situation where the rent will be frozen considerably below what the property could be protected and carried on for otherwise. Is there any remedy for that situation at all?

Mr. STEAGALL. That question is directed to the provisions of the existing law and its administration. There would be authority under this act to correct any of the injustices and inequities to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. PATRICK. I thank the gentleman very much.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the President is authorized to issue an order or orders regulating the rent of real property and regulating or prohibiting the recovery of possession of such property, without regard to subsequent sale, and any practices or agreements relating to leasing or renting such property or the possession or occupancy thereof. So far as practicable, any such order shall stabilize rents for such property on the basis of the rents for such property on September 15, 1942, and may make such provisions for classifications, exceptions, or adjustments as the President finds necessary to correct gross inequities or to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to aid in the effective prevention of inflation in accordance with the purposes and provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and of the act of

October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes." Nothing in this act shall be construed to invalidate any provision of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 or of the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," or to invalidate any regulation or order, or designation or declaration, issued or effective under either of said acts.

SEC. 2. The President may, from time to time, promulgate such regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this act; and may exercise any power and authority conferred by this act through such agent, agency, or official as he may direct. All provisions, including prohibitions and penalties, of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this act shall be applicable in the same manner and for the same purposes with respect to regulations or orders issued by the Price Administrator in the exercise of any functions which may be delegated to him under authority of this act.

SEC. 3. Provisions of this act and of all orders and regulations issued hereunder shall terminate on June 30, 1944, or on such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation shall prescribe.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, beginning after the enacting clause, strike out all of the text down through the word "purposes" in line 9 on page 2, and insert the following: "That in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, the President is authorized and directed to issue an order or orders regulating and stabilizing the rent of residential and commercial real property, including the rent and rates charged by hotels and rooming houses, in the several States, and in the Territories and possessions of the United States, including the District of Columbia. The President may make such provisions for adjustments of such rents and rates as he finds necessary to correct gross inequities or to aid in the effective prosecution of the war in accordance with the purposes and provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and of the act of October 2, 1942, entitled 'An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes.'"

On page 3, after section 3, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 4. All acts and parts of acts, to the extent that they are in conflict with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this matter has been covered pretty well under the reservation of objection to consideration of the bill, but I think the statement should be made that when the Price Control Act was passed, it was intended by everyone that rents should be included and it was quite generally agreed that rents were included in that measure. However, when Justice Byrnes took the position which he now holds, he decided that there might be some question as to whether rents were included in price control and the bill which was introduced had, as its purpose, the clarification of that situation. So this bill, in substance, merely removes any doubt which formerly existed in respect of

whether or not rents were included in the stabilization of prices, and for that reason it was a unanimous report of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Justice Byrnes told us in committee yesterday that it was his interpretation of the language that the term "commercial properties" might not include hotels and rooming houses and so to clarify that situation we included the rates and rents charged by hotels and rooming houses. I might say, parenthetically, one of the things which prompted the committee to consider including hotels and rooming houses, was the attitude of some hotel proprietors in taking advantage of these unfortunate people who walk from one hotel to another in the District of Columbia and then finally have to pay a large premium for the privilege of sleeping in a local hotel. It came to our knowledge that one individual at a District of Columbia hotel was compelled to pay \$15 for very humble accommodations in a hotel in the District. We thought there should be some regulation of that chiseling, racketeering practice if it existed. If it does not exist there is no harm done, but if it does exist then the Administrator or the President is given authority to correct it.

We made very sure that the rents of farm properties would not be included, and so in classifying property as residential or commercial property, we intended by that language to exempt farm property.

I believe the bill otherwise follows the general language of the Price Control Act and accomplishes the purpose of the committee, and I believe the Administrators of the act will require nothing more to bring rents and charges and rates of hotels and rooming houses within the price-control structure.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I think it is a wise provision to take care of the racketeers where they are increasing the rents, but let us take this situation. Suppose some boarding house or some hotel property did not increase its rents, but taxes have been increased and the cost of labor has increased and they find today that they are going into the red in the operation of their hotel property, can they go to Justice Byrnes and his organization and submit the proposition and have the rents fixed in accordance with the cost of operation of the property?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Without any question of doubt they can do that. In the original bill, as introduced, there was an attempt made to tie the rents to September 15, 1942.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But the gentleman will notice that we struck that from the bill and in the amendment which has

been considered in the committee and is now recommended by the committee, all reference to any date has been eliminated and the President is authorized and directed to regulate and stabilize rents of residential and commercial real property, including the rent and rates charged by hotels and rooming houses without regard to any particular date. This gives him or any agency he designates to administer the law, the authority to consider each case on its merits and two rooming houses on the same street might be classified differently in respect of the rates they might charge to cover the increase or decrease in cost of operation. The same thing is true with respect to commercial property and the measure covers situations where perhaps, for some years, commercial property owners in small villages in the agricultural sections of the United States have rented their property for just what they could get for it because of the agricultural situation. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] propounded an inquiry as to whether this would freeze those extremely low rents in those unfortunate localities which had to rent their property upon a basis of farm income, particularly in the drought area. This bill was designedly written in such a manner that the President or any agency he named could take into consideration those unusual cases and adjust the rents to meet present costs and anticipated costs.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not believe we should stabilize rents by granting subsidies. Was any thought given to using subsidies to keep rents down in any sections of the United States?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; subsidies are not included in any of the rent-control acts, but if it becomes necessary to subsidize to do the job, then they will be back here asking us for that authority.

Up to the present time they have not been given authority to subsidize, to stabilize wages, salaries, prices, rents, or rates charged for accommodations.

Mr. CARLSON. It is understood by some that the present Price Control Act authorizes the Administrator to use subsidies where necessary to keep prices under control.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; and prices cannot be controlled by Government subsidies. When we subsidize, all we do is transfer the payment of the inflated price from the individual to the Government.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is aware, of course, that the United States Government has spent many hundreds of millions of dollars to erect housing, public housing in congested areas, including defense housing and low-cost housing. Did the committee consider whether or not this authority being given to the Administrator would cover the rents in the public-housing projects?



Mr. WOLCOTT. All the President would have to do under the authority of this act would be to designate the Public Housing Authority, the local public housing authority, as the agency through which rents in that particular project would be regulated. We did not give consideration to it directly, but this committee, the gentleman understands, set up the legislation for those projects, and we have always protected the authority given to the local housing authority to administer those acts. There is nothing in this act conflicting with the U. S. H. A. or the F. H. A. in the management of those projects, but probably I should say, qualifying that, there is authority on the part of the President to change rents of the projects if he sees fit, but it is not to be presumed that the President will use the authority here to supersede a local authority, which he himself or which under the act has been set up and over which he has jurisdiction.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is the point that I would like to have clarified. I know of two or three instances in public-housing projects where, because of a change in conditions, the local administrator raised the rents considerably, in fact, in some instances, as much as 50 percent, and there is some question as to whether or not that raise was justified.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The United States Housing Authority has jurisdiction over that; and if they authorize the increase in rent to defeat the purpose of the U. S. H. A., which was to provide low-cost housing, then it is reprehensible, and the President should step in and correct that situation. We give him the authority to do it in this bill if he sees fit.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The Rent Administrator did have to step in in one instance and cause a reduction in the rent which the local housing authority insisted upon receiving. I would like to know who has the ultimate authority. If we find the local Housing Authority is doing something reprehensible, it ought to be definite that the Administrator would have authority to correct that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. All local housing is under the jurisdiction of the President or the agency that he sets up for that purpose within the administrative branch of the Government. That agency can correct any inequalities or injustices, because it is the administrative agency of the Government that is creating that situation. If they have the authority to create injustices, by the same token they can correct them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think in this act we should give complete authority over rents including rents of all public housing projects.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say to the gentleman that we have done so.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it true that the Rent Director or Administrator of the provisions of this act will have the

ultimate authority to supervise all rents in public housing projects?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Unless the President sees fit to delegate authority under this act to a local housing authority. He has that power. I am sure that he will respect the agencies already set up.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. In these defense areas there is a lot of property that does not belong to the Government, and is not under the control of the Government, privately owned properties. In many instances they have local rent directors of some kind in those localities. What are they going to do? Are they going to be melted into this? Does this supersede them?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. Those agencies, as I understand it, are a part of the O. P. A. set-up, and the President is authorized to utilize any agency that has been set up to do this job. He could either set up new agencies under this new system, which has been created with Mr. Justice Byrnes as Administrator, or he can continue to operate this under the O. P. A. Of course, it is generally thought that this job from now on will be turned over to Justice Byrnes and his department.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Here is a town, say, in a defense area, and I know of one such instance and they have two administrators now who administer the rent, in all the privately owned concerns. Here is another town, 10 miles away from that, that is not located in a defense area, and they would have to come to Washington under this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not believe they would have to come to Washington. They would have to go to whatever local agency the President or Mr. Byrnes set up to administer the law.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. In other words, town A and town B would have to go to different authorities unless they were melted together?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. This bill puts the whole United States upon the same basis in respect to rent control and gives the President authority to make adjustments to correct inequalities, to keep rents down and thereby help to avoid inflation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I think it is well that something be said in behalf of the chairman of this committee. He has done a difficult job. With praiseworthy perseverance he steered the recent bill through, almost on the time limit demanded by the President. He has presented this bill promptly. I favor the bill, of course. But there will be a lot of grief in this bill for property owners affected by its provisions. However, the main purpose of my remarks is to remind the House that I rejoice in the recognition of the dignity of the House, inasmuch as we have been consulted in the matter. Justice Byrnes has recognized the wisdom of asking us to pass this legislation. There was no suggestion that under the Constitution the President already has

the authority. I also want to call your attention to the fact that within 12 hours after we passed the recent bill, which we were ordered to pass on or before a certain date, an order came forth from the White House, fully prepared in advance. I want it fully understood that we are not so dumb here that we do not recognize that that order was prepared in advance; that they could not have divined what our action in legislation would be when it was prepared. The order congratulated the House on its action. I fail to appreciate the compliment. To remind you that the provisions of that legislation were not meticulously noted in drawing that order, I refer you to the language adopted relating to the cost of production to be allowed the farmer.

I call attention to this because in my remarks during the passage of the bill I suggested it, and it appeared in the order that soil-conservation checks and other benefit checks to the farmers should be taken into account. What a surprise that must have been to the farmers' supporters. You know the press of the country proclaimed a glorious victory. The order seems to be a direct violation. It would seem that the order had been previously prepared and would have been promulgated according to the promise made whether we acted or not. It was a historical proceeding. We jumped through the hoop according to orders, but I think little attention was paid to the legislation that we passed in drawing that order. It seemingly was prepared for in advance. Certainly it would have been promulgated. That is my opinion from all the assumptions I am forced to recognize.

In this particular original bill there was a guide in that that September 15 would be the day selected when these rents would be frozen. Now it is entirely up to the administration what date it will select. But the escape in this whole legislation is in order for the successful prosecution of the war the President can do as he pleases. If labor is dissatisfied and goes on strike, he can advance wages. If in these defense areas there are no places to live, he can advance rates. Private capital would hardly dare to venture, because the rates prevailing on September 15 were too low, and now there will be no definite rates until proclaimed by the Administrator. I foresee this war lasting a long time. It means more defense areas. More Lanham bills! More Lanham bills! What private concern would construct these houses? The Government must continue to do it.

In my own district I am surrounded by camps. We would build houses, but we do not dare. Even now with this limitation of September 15 off, we would not venture anyone could make complaints that the rents were too high, and then we would be at the mercy of the President, through his administrator, another Government strait jacket.

The joy of your office is almost removed today, because you are but a chore boy trying to get justice for your constituents, in your attempts to joust with these department heads, who have been appointed by the President, who make the rules and regulations. Our job is to

prove to them that there should be an exception once in awhile to these rules and regulations. It is difficult.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. This worries me greatly. Constantly over the telephone, constantly writing, "We know you have made this rule. But this should be an exception." But they so often hide behind the rule—they don't like to make exceptions. We are blamed for it.

Some assistant writes a letter over the signature of the Department head. Often with difficulty we learn who made the decision. There may be a hundred making decisions under one department. All are bound under the rule to follow that rule, and seldom will grant exception until it can be taken to the head officials for approval. Often these assistants agree that the exception ought to be made. But it is a slow process. They should promptly make exceptions where exceptions ought to be made and more real authority granted to those who have been assigned consideration. We now are very fearful of the many rules to be promulgated under this price-control order. We will have to intervene in countless cases.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the Committee on Banking and Currency is to be congratulated on the attention given this bill. The original bill would have certified to the executive branch not only rent practices but occupancy and the use of all real property in the country, including the farmer.

Mr. GIFFORD. I think the committee ought to be congratulated. You evidently recall the original bill containing the word "occupancy." It must have been put in there by someone most desirous of obtaining extraordinary powers. In that original version they could have given orders as to whom should occupy the vacant rooms in your own house. I give great credit to the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan, who rewrote this bill. He did not fail to grasp the situation promptly. I give great credit also to the chairman of the committee, who immediately accepted the amended form. Mr. Justice Byrnes himself did not seem to realize the enormity of the powers asked for.

Now, let us have some courage in demanding from the administration exceptions where they should be given. This is all that is left to the Congressman in adjusting the wrongs of his constituents.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts has much to say about the President's orders being written in advance. It occurs to me it is very much like the trial of a case. When the trial has continued for 3 or 4 weeks—and the recent amendment to the price-control

bill was pending in Congress 3 or 4 weeks—you would naturally expect the trial judge to have his charge to the jury ready at the end of the testimony. This is exactly what the administration did; the administration was on the alert, they were wide awake, they had people studying this legislation as it was considered in the House and in the Senate, and then when the bill was finally passed several days elapsed before it was necessary to write the orders. I see nothing in that which would justify the gentleman from Massachusetts in saying that the President was trying to ridicule us.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Surely it was a fair assumption that I should take and that the gentleman ought to take, that that order was prepared several days before it was signed and promulgated.

Mr. PATMAN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman and say that any wide-awake administration would do the same thing. I am afraid the gentleman did not hear my other remarks. I compared it to the trial of a case in court. If the trial lasts for 3 or 4 weeks the judge at the end of that time has his charge ready, he knows what to charge the jury, and would be the object of just criticism if he did not. The gentleman might as well criticize a judge for preparing his charge in advance as to criticize the President for working on the orders and regulations he would have to promulgate after the legislation became law.

Mr. GIFFORD. May I suggest that perhaps the thought is that the Congress should be prepared to conform legislation to regulations.

Mr. PATMAN. No; I am just giving that illustration as evidence of the fact that there is no ridicule in it; it is just a question of being wide awake, alive, and alert. I think the administration should be criticized if it is not on the alert and does not do exactly what was done in this case. There is no ground for criticism at all.

Regarding the September 15 date, which was in the original bill, that all rents and prices would be fixed considering the September 15 date, the committee decided that was not a good thing to do because possibly rents had been raised three or four hundred percent by September 15, 1942, and that possibly the President should have the power to go back and fix a date as of the time the residential rates were fixed, maybe a year ago, maybe a year and a half ago. I believe the committee was perfectly reasonable and did exactly the right thing by leaving that power in the hands of the Executive. He has the power to enforce all other rules, regulations, and practices regarding this price-control bill.

The gentleman was rather critical about the Government making it easy to occupy and encourage the occupancy of houses around the war plants. I do not know whether the gentleman stated on the floor, but certainly he did before the committee, that he was in the real-estate business himself, and that his people would like to build houses. I suggest

to him, as Mr. Justice Byrnes suggested to him before the committee yesterday, that surely he would not want to build any houses around war plants that would possibly become ghost cities when the war is over, and we do not know when the war will be over. It is not, therefore, depriving the gentleman of any opportunity he would want under normal and reasonable conditions.

Mr. GIFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, I should like to interject there that I have not had any confidence to build houses for some 8 years.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman, of course, has had the finest opportunity in the world had he wanted to build houses; he not only had the encouragement of the Government, but in some cases the money would have been furnished him to help build the houses where they were needed by families who expected to occupy the houses as homes.

Mr. Speaker, I think the pending legislation is a fine addition to the Price Control Act and hope it becomes law as written.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, it should be made clear that the purpose of this bill is to supplement existing law and that it supersedes any or all laws that possibly conflict with it.

Reference has been made to the existing law applicable only to the District of Columbia. In this connection I wish to call attention to the fact that the existing District of Columbia Rent Control Act does not embrace hotel properties. The original Price Control Act did confer upon the Price Administrator specific authority in defense areas and in the District of Columbia, and regardless of whether the District of Columbia is declared a defense area, that act included hotel properties. For some reason the Administrator of the Price Control Act has never exercised that authority. In view of the immense increase in population and Government activities it was thought the District of Columbia presented unusual reason for such control. Certainly under the bill now before us, with its specific authority and direction, we may expect adequate control of rents and rates in the city of Washington as well as elsewhere.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. So long as this language remains in the bill: "The President may make such provisions for adjustment of such rents and rates as he finds necessary to correct inequities or to aid in the effective prosecution of the war," are we not in danger of having most anything done? I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that language was in the last price-control bill that we passed and that in the administration of that price-control bill recently they have placed a price ceiling on flour that reflected a price of wheat of 76 percent of parity; they have placed a ceiling on potatoes that means from 65 to 75 percent of parity in the East, approximately 80 percent of parity in the Midwest and 150 percent of parity on the Pacific coast.



That is just the beginning of a lot of inequities that they are doing contrary to the intent of Congress and contrary to the absolute language of the law that was passed.

Mr. STEAGALL. I may say to the gentleman that the language in the original bill which was presented me to be introduced was much broader than the language embodied in the provisions now before the House and which it is proposed to adopt. Justice Byrnes and I agreed upon amendments that would limit the authority to residential and commercial property; then upon suggestions of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] and other members of the committee, we specifically added hotels and rooming houses. Those limitations are in the bill. The language to which the gentleman refers is only a declaration of the purpose of the act. The specific language would control.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Does the gentleman think that the Office of Price Administration is giving sufficient consideration to the intent of Congress when it makes these price-ceiling orders?

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman knows my views with reference to price control. I have not been in accord at all times with the action of the Administrator in administering the law as it relates to commodities such as the gentleman has outlined, but that question is not involved in the present legislation.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the gentleman, this bill covers all territory, including defense territory where rent regulations now exist?

Mr. STEAGALL. Unquestionably that is so.

Mr. MICHENER. In national-defense territories where rent regulations now exist, if a tenant or roomer occupies an apartment or a house and is a defense worker, there is no possible way under the regulations that the owner may remove that person unless he proves him to be a nuisance or sells the property, as I understand it. I think that is the regulation. Assuming that that is the law or the regulation in force today, would this bill have any effect on such regulation?

Mr. STEAGALL. This bill would supersede any and all authority that is in conflict with it at any point.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, to include an address by Edward A. O'Neal, a

member of the new Board of Economic Stabilization just appointed, notwithstanding the fact that it will require three and a half pages of the RECORD at an estimated cost of \$157.50.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

#### BILL TO AID AUTOMOBILE DEALERS WITH CARS FROZEN ON THEIR HANDS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include my remarks concerning a bill, and a copy of the bill, with reference to the purchase of automobiles by the Government that was reported by the committee yesterday and which we hope will be taken up in the House tomorrow by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

#### BILL SPONSORED BY HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress who has been in close touch with the trials and tribulations of the retail automobile dealers of the United States, it was a pleasure and a privilege for me to introduce on September 22 last H. R. 7573, a bill prepared for the same purposes as the one now under consideration. This bill is designed to authorize the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Director of Procurement to acquire motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles necessary for the successful prosecution of the present war.

This bill is sponsored and endorsed by the House Committee on Small Business composed of Messrs. BULWINKLE, KELLY of Illinois, FITZGERALD, HALLECK, LEONARD W. HALL, PLOESER, and myself as chairman.

Simultaneously, a companion bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator MURRAY. Senator MURRAY and I long have been interested in the plight of the retail automobile dealers of the country, who, as you all know, have suffered greatly as a result of the Government freezing new car sales on January 1 last.

A change in the available source of car supply is responsible for the bill. Until cars were frozen in dealers' hands by Executive order, Government purchases were made from manufacturers at approximately wholesale prices. There now no longer being any wholesale supply, purchases must be made from retailers. Hence, a revision of the law to enable the Government to pay fair retail prices is sought.

Since Senator MURRAY and I introduced this bill it has been referred to all Government departments affected and they have approved it verbally or in writing. Conferences about the bill have been held with the Bureau of the Budget and as a result the Bureau directed a letter to the President on October 8 last, approving the measure with minor changes. The President, in turn, in a communication to the Senate, Public

Document S. 263, approved the wording of the amendment as suggested by the Bureau of the Budget.

The wording of the bill, as proposed by the Budget, appears in the bill now under consideration. With the full endorsement of everyone concerned, including Government departments and the N. A. D. A., representing the 38,000 remaining dealers of the country, I substituted the Budget wording for the original bill. Without opposition from any source, the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments reported the bill favorably on Tuesday, October 13.

Senator MURRAY, likewise, on Monday, October 12, was granted a hearing by the Senate Appropriations Committee on his companion measure, Senate bill 2753. I understand that there was no serious opposition to the purposes of the bill on the Senate side and that the measure is to be considered soon.

This measure which, I repeat, has the full approval of the President and the Bureau of the Budget, is to meet new conditions which have arisen during the war. In a word, the provisions of this bill, if adopted, would greatly accelerate the purchase of badly needed cars by the various Government departments and, at the same time, provide strict supervision of these purchases by the Bureau of the Budget.

Commencing in 1925, the appropriation acts for the Army, Navy, and other governmental agencies prescribed the number of passenger cars that could be purchased during each fiscal year and also prescribed price limitations. It was the general practice to send out invitations for bids and to purchase from the lowest bidders. A great many of the sales were made directly by the automobile manufacturers although dealers also were in the practice of bidding on these purchases. The manufacturers were quite willing to sell at the wholesale price, or even lower, and dealers were willing to sell at cost, or even below cost in some cases, in order to add to their volume of sales by reason of the fact that many manufacturers had brackets of discounts which increased according to volume.

In the last few years there has been no limitation on the number of automobiles that the Army was permitted to purchase, but, commencing in 1934, a price limit of \$750 was provided for light automobiles and \$1,200 for medium automobiles. The Sixth Supplemental Defense Appropriation Act, which was approved on April 28, 1942, increased the price limitation on low-priced automobiles to \$925 for all purchases by the Army, Navy, and other governmental agencies. This increase was made by reason of the fact that the wholesale price of automobiles has risen considerably and progressively during the past few years.

With the freezing of automobiles on January 1 and the stoppage of production in February, practically all new automobiles in the country are in the hands of retail automobile dealers. These automobiles can only be sold to those purchasers whom the Office of Price Administration has specified in its ration-

ing regulation 2-A, which includes the Army, Navy, and other governmental agencies, and a restricted list of civilians whose occupations have been deemed essential to the war effort or to the maintenance of health and safety. The automobiles which dealers had in their possession prior to the freezing order on January 1 and those which they received from manufacturers during the first 15 days of January are subject to sale under the rationing order, and the approximately 135,000 passenger cars, which were the last to be produced and which were shipped after the 16th of January, are being held in a separate pool for release after March 1943.

It recently became apparent that, following the normal line of preference, four-door sedans in the lower-priced lines were selling the fastest, and the Army, in anticipation of its needs, sought to purchase all of the four-door sedans in the Chevrolet, Ford, and Plymouth lines. By reason of the fact that their needs approximated the total number of these four-door cars which were in both the rationed stock and in the 1943 pool, O. P. A. issued an order on August 18 prohibiting the sale of any of these four-door cars to anyone other than the Army, Navy, and other governmental agencies. The Army is experiencing difficulty in obtaining bids for these cars as the retail price in many instances exceeds the \$925 statutory limitation. The \$925 limitation was designed as a wholesale limitation and operates too restrictively at the retail level.

Furthermore, the Navy Department is particularly handicapped by the limitation as to the number of passenger-carrying vehicles which it can purchase, and it has been compelled to obtain the passenger-carrying vehicles which it requires by purchasing station wagons and light trucks converted into station wagons. This has been undesirable, as station wagons are more expensive vehicles than ordinary passenger cars and the supply of station wagons in the country has been exhausted.

These limitations, therefore, are having the effect of hampering the Army and Navy in their efforts to obtain the passenger-carrying vehicles which they require for the prosecution of this war, and the limitation is operating unfairly for automobile dealers who are anxious and willing to sell the Army and Navy the vehicles which they require, but, at the same time, having been so badly hit by the requirements of the war effort, they do not feel they should be compelled to sacrifice the last remaining few units of merchandise which they will have to sell for the duration of the war by reason of a limitation which was imposed for peacetime purposes, but which is unfair and inadequate for the rapidly expanding needs of the greatly increased Army and Navy during wartime.

Automobile dealers are quite satisfied with the prices which they are permitted to obtain under price schedule 85, which was established by the Office of Price Administration for new passenger automobiles. Under that price schedule, they are permitted to charge the list price, Federal excise tax, transportation

at rail rates, a handling charge of 5 percent of the list price, and transportation, or \$75, whichever is lower, and 15 percent of the list price for each calendar month or greater part thereof that has elapsed since February 1 to the date of sale.

The bill, therefore, proposes that the limitations be removed but that prices charged may not exceed maximum price ceilings established by the war-time price authority, the Office of Price Administration. While the elimination of the \$925 limitation will not increase the cost of these vehicles appreciably to the Army and Navy the realization of the retail price on each unit will very materially increase the chances of the individual dealer being able to continue in business to render the essential service which will be required to keep private automobiles running to transport defense workers and to accomplish other essential direct war needs.

It will be noted that the language of the bill only contemplates the removal of these limitations for the fiscal year expiring June 30, 1943, leaving it within the discretion of Congress to reconsider the question of limitations in the future. The purpose of this bill is to meet an immediate problem—that of permitting the armed services to acquire the vehicles they require and to make it possible for dealers to obtain a fair price for these vehicles. The price to be established can in no event exceed that which has been and is being paid by all other classes of eligible purchasers of new automobiles.

#### PATRIOTIC ATTITUDE OF DEALERS PRAISED

I cannot close my remarks without paying tribute to the patriotic attitude that retail automobile dealers have shown since their car stocks were frozen. I have said here and elsewhere that these dealers were the number one business casualty of the war. I understand that their receipts have been off more than 60 percent on a national basis. Despite this fact, I have yet to hear one dealer complain or see one take any other than a patriotic attitude. To date, not one of them has made an unreasonable request of Congress and I certainly think that they are entitled to the fair deal which this bill is designed to give them. It seems to me that common fairness to the dealer, if nothing else, would warrant immediate passage of this bill, and since it is desired by everyone in the executive departments from the President down, it certainly should have our immediate approval.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to authorize the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Director of Procurement to acquire motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles necessary for the successful prosecution of the present war

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the limitation of \$925 specified in section 405 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, and any similar limitation specified in any other appropriation act for the fiscal year 1943 may be exceeded by such amount as the Secretary of War, in the case of the War Department, the Secretary of the Navy, in the case of the Navy Department, the Commissioners, in the case of the Government of the District of Columbia, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in

the case of other essential governmental needs, may determine necessary to obtain satisfactory motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, but in no event shall the price so paid for any such vehicle exceed the maximum price for such vehicle established by the Office of Price Administration.

#### RECOGNITION OF SERVICES OF CIVILIANS IN CONSTRUCTION OF PANAMA CANAL

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 553, Rept. No. 2571), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1481) to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### INVESTIGATION OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS BY COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 550 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on the Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed (a) to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in the departments and agencies of the Government including Government-owned corporations; (b) to study and investigate the effect of such policies and practices upon the conduct of the war, with the view of determining whether such policies and practices are efficient and economical; (c) to determine the number of employees in each department or agency (including Government-owned corporations), whether such number of employees is necessary, and whether their skills are used to the best advantage; (d) all other matters relating to the recruiting and the efficient and economical use of the civilian employees; and (e) to make such inquiry as said Committee on the Civil Service may consider important or pertinent to any matter coming within the jurisdiction of said committee.

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpoena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated



by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been unanimously reported by the Rules Committee after hearing the chairman of the Civil Service Committee, our beloved and respected colleague, in whom we all have the utmost confidence. We are of the opinion that under his direction this will be a fair, unbiased investigation that will bring about, as we believe, extremely favorable results so far as economy and efficiency are concerned and will bring about the elimination of unnecessary employees in many of the departments of the Government as there are now, so it has been stated.

Mr. Speaker, for years the House has refused, with few exceptions, to authorize the creation of investigating committees on the theory that such investigating committees merely served as junketing trips for members and little or no good in the way of beneficial remedial legislation resulted from such investigations. However, since the Teapot Dome investigation and one or two later investigations by House and Senate committees, Congress is realizing that investigations fairly and properly conducted, where the law is followed and the committee had no axes to grind, have been helpful and beneficial.

It has been testified in the hearings before the Committee on Rules that some departments and agencies are overloaded with employees, that unnecessary transfers from one department or agency to another have been made at higher compensations, and that persons have been appointed without an assignment to actual work or duties for 2 and 3 months and, in some instances, for even a longer period. The attention of the committee has been directed to the charges made by persons both in and outside of the departments and agencies that they have observed many employees loafing on the job, duplicating work, and performing "red tape." I appreciate that many of the charges that have been made cannot be substantiated but, surely, all the people who have complained cannot be wrong in reporting that many employees are not working or that many of the offices are overloaded with unnecessary help.

Some gentlemen assert that the President could issue an Executive order to bring about the elimination of unnecessary employees, but there is a question as to that because under the law the vast majority of appointments are made upon the requests of the departments and agencies from the civil-service registers. I know that on several occasions the President has urged that employment be limited to actual needs and that strict economy be practiced. Unfortunately, many of the heads of the various bureaus

and divisions in the departments and agencies have been under civil service for many years, and, despite the President's suggestions and recommendations, they insist that the employees serving under them are necessary and in some departments, since war has been declared, they have called for additional help which, commensurate with the work they are doing, is not necessary. Unfortunately, many of the heads are Republicans and it is difficult to obtain their cooperation to a fair policy of employment.

Some newspapers frequently charge that Members of Congress are responsible for the appointment of many of these employees, but I am satisfied that such is not the case. It is true we appropriate the money, but I venture to say that not one in one thousand has been appointed on the recommendation of Members. The appropriation acts and the laws creating the new agencies specifically require appointments from the civil-service registers and it comes with poor grace to charge Members with being responsible for appointments.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service informed the Committee on Rules that 2,357,932 workers are on the Federal pay roll and the purpose of the resolution before us is, as I have stated, to determine whether there is an overloading of employees in certain departments and if their services may be properly dispensed with. For the enlightenment of the House and country, I shall insert at this point that part of the resolution, as follows:

(a) To conduct thorough studies and investigation of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in the departments and agencies of the Government, including Government-owned corporations; (b) to study and investigate the effect of such policies and practices upon the conduct of the war, with the view of determining whether such policies and practices are efficient and economical; (c) to determine the number of employees in each department or agency (including Government-owned corporations), whether such number of employees is necessary, and whether their skills are used to the best advantage; (d) all other matters relating to the recruiting and the efficient and economical use of the civilian employees; and (e) to make such inquiry as said Committee on the Civil Service may consider important or pertinent to any matter coming within the jurisdiction of said committee.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to say that there is also a demand that the Committee on Rules approve a resolution to investigate, as is claimed, the large unnecessary number of men who have been commissioned in the Army and Navy, some of whom it is claimed have been commissioned to save them from induction in the service. Of course, I know that many of the men should have received commissions, having left posts which paid them two or three times a greater compensation than the grade to which they were commissioned. Still, I feel that through certain outside influences, not congressional, please, some such appointments have been made.

It is also charged that many of the heads of some of the departments have been importuned and influenced in certifying some employees to the draft board as essential in their assignment and that

therefore they have been deferred and excused from military service. I am satisfied that these matters will be looked into in a fair and thorough manner.

These two matters do not come within the province of the Ramspeck resolution, but our committee intend to obtain further information with respect to these matters and if conditions warrant we may take appropriate action in having one of the House committees go into the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by the majority leader that he has agreed that no controversial matters will be taken up. In view of that fact, and in view of the fact that the ranking minority member does not wish to say anything because he has already made his statement favoring the resolution, the same as other Members, I am going to move the previous question.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. What the chairman of the Committee on Rules has stated is correct, but I have just received a request to make a few remarks.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Michigan knows that I would be the last man to deny any request coming from him, because I know he has the welfare of the Nation and of the House always at heart. Consequently, I yield to him as much time as he may desire.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the pending resolution. I know its execution is entrusted to competent hands and to a competent committee. I think if anybody can do a real job on this matter it is the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], who knows the civil-service picture quite well. My only regret is that he does not go far enough and we do not set up a permanent agency to make continuous and systematic investigations through the agencies of government. There are probably 150 such agencies today.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. This resolution gives the committee the power to investigate not only the regular agencies of the Government but any corporation wholly or partially owned by the Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I recognize that fact.

The thing I want to make clear is that there must be a permanent agency that is staffed with experts and that does this work continuously. The overstaffing of Federal agencies is not new. It is only because this thing has become so excessive it seems, and assumed such proportions, that it becomes a genuine emergency with which we must deal at once. But we should be dealing with it day after day. Exploring inefficiency, overstaffing, and unnecessary functions should be continuous.

There is an agency of government that could be staffed, whose authority could be expanded for that purpose, and

that is the General Accounting Office. When it was created under the so-called budgetary system in 1921 we made the Comptroller General accountable to the Congress, and he can be removed only by a joint resolution of this body. He is independent. He holds office for 15 years. We have a great Comptroller General today, a man with integrity, ability, and character, who was once a Member of this House. He, if provided with funds and personnel, could and would do this job.

In my judgment, it is essential in the interest of real efficiency and real economy that we implement the General Accounting Office and the hands of the Comptroller General so that he can constantly go through these agencies with experts, week in and week out, then make recurring reports to the Congress indicating in what respect functions can be abolished and in what respect employees can be superseded, and so really get some efficiency into the executive branch.

I have prepared a bill which I am going to introduce this week. It will set up a department in the General Accounting Office; maybe we will call it the Federal Efficiency Service. I want to see the Comptroller General get several million dollars additional every year. I want him to have some experts in every field of government and then send them into the agencies and let them come back and make their reports, let the chips fall where they may. When the Congress and the General Accounting Office are implemented with that kind of an instrumentality, there is no question about what will happen. There will be efficiency, there will be economy, there will be the curtailment and the abolition of expendable functions in the interest of the general welfare.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not want to be just in the position of paying a compliment to the gentleman while he is making this splendid presentation, but I had intended days ago to write him a letter saying that the recent speech he made on the subject of the responsibility of the Members of Congress to streamline its procedure in the manner the gentleman has indicated is in my opinion one of the fine contributions the gentleman from Illinois has made to this body.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my friend from West Virginia. I am going to do my best to have some kind of an instrumentality set up to arm the Congress, for otherwise we are going to come dangerously close to the violation of the power of the legislative branch.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I was here at the time and helped draft the law setting up a Budget system and the General Accounting Office. As stated by the gentleman, the Comptroller General is presumed to be responsible to the Congress; he is the agent of the Congress, just as the Director of the Budget is responsible

to the Executive. It seems to me that the bill now before us provides that a certain task be performed now which could not possibly be performed by the General Accounting Office in time to be of any assistance now. The General Accounting Office is just as busy as it can be determining whether or not the money which the Congress has appropriated is paid out in accordance with the laws the Congress has passed. That is its principal function, but it is an entirely different function from that proposed by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I quite agree with the gentleman from Michigan that this resolution must be adopted; that this is an emergency matter and needs attention now. But I find on examining the statute which created the General Accounting Office that there are certain powers that ought to be delegated and certain provisions made for more experts who are chosen purely on the basis of fitness, if we are going to have these systematic and concerted examinations of the operations of the Government.

When all is said and done, there is but one way to achieve real economy, and that is through the judicious and intelligent use of the power of the purse, which is lodged in the Congress. But that power cannot be wisely utilized in the interest of efficiency unless the Congress is advised concerning the functions of government which can be streamlined or abolished or modified, the number and kind of personnel necessary to the discharge of those functions, and the employment of the best and most efficient techniques in the operations of government. To ascertain these facts requires careful investigation. It requires more than that. It requires careful investigation by experts skilled in the art of administration and management who can be assigned to the various agencies for sustained and constant study of their processes. I know of no better place in Government to lodge this power than to place it in the General Accounting Office, with an expanded staff and adequate powers. In my judgment, such a step is imperative to balanced government, efficient service, economical operation, and to full participation by the legislative branch.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BLAND]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I hold here in my hand a little volume entitled, "The Illustrious Dunderheads," edited by Rex Stout and illustrated by William Gropper. This volume proceeds to list the voting records of a number of my colleagues in Congress and to list sentences and phrases from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to make it appear that they are Nazi propagandists and should be removed from the Halls of Congress.

What a team Mr. Stout and Mr. Gropper make. For the information of the House and the accused "Dunderheads," I should like to inform you that Stout and Gropper have assisted in the preparation of other volumes equally as silly; namely, the official Communist publication—the New Masses. If you will examine the June 1928 issue of New Masses, you will find listed as owner, Rex Stout. You will also find him listed as a contributing editor of this official publication of the Communist Party, as well as being a member of the executive board.

An examination of any of the issues of the Daily Worker or the New Masses will show the artistic talents of Mr. Gropper spread throughout its pages. I could set forth in the RECORD the other Communist affiliations of these two individuals, but I think that this should serve to enlighten the membership as to the source of this attack.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I got a special order to address the House for 1 hour today. The subject of that speech is The Biggest Bottleneck in Our War Effort, the heart of our capital, the situation here in Washington.

As some of you will recall, 7 months ago I introduced a resolution, practically the same as that introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] to investigate and determine the facts about the situation in Washington as they were then. Of course, my resolution was not agreed to, but we are running true to form today, just as we were with respect to the rubber situation, 10 months late—we are about 8 or 9 months behind time with this investigation—as I say, just about true to form.

I hope this resolution will be adopted. My resolution called for a special committee to make this investigation and to determine the facts in regard to the matter, but I have every confidence in our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] and I believe that his committee will make honest findings and propose such remedial measures as are necessary to put Washington on the beam and thus expedite an earlier victory, saving many lives and many, many heartaches.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself time to make just one observation. We all have that confidence in the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] to which the previous speaker has referred.

I do want again to call attention to the fact that time is of the essence with respect to any action that may be taken by this committee. The evils do exist. The gentleman from Georgia has thoroughly convinced the Rules Committee of that fact. The gentleman knows where they exist. I was hopeful that an Executive order of the President would make an investigation unnecessary, but the evil must be stopped and time for debate has passed. Let us let the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] go to work and expect him to get results and bring something back here soon. I said, soon.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, all I wish to say in answer to my colleague from



Illinois and the other gentlemen is that the Rules Committee has been considering a rule for a joint House and Senate investigating committee, but we came to the conclusion that it would not be satisfactory and that time is of the essence and, consequently, having all the confidence in the world, as everybody has, in the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] we thought this would bring about immediate results and we reported the resolution unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HAINES] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in Public Law 603, a law entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interest of successful prosecution of the war," the House wrote the following language when it adopted an amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]:

In any case in which a small business concern or group of such concerns has been certified by or under the authority of the Chairman of the War Production Board to be a competent Government contractor with respect to capacity and credit as to a specific Government procurement contract, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Director of the Procurement Division of the Treasury, and all other officers of the Government having procurement powers are directed to accept such certification as conclusive, and are authorized to let such Government procurement contract to such concern or group of concerns without requiring it to meet any other requirements with respect to capacity and credit.

That language is very plain, I think. But the contracts have not been spread in accordance with it.

The speech I have asked time to make today is not an easy one for me to make, but there are certain things that I feel need very much to be said. The first thing I want to say is that I think there still remains much too great a tendency to let the whole of certain huge contracts to one or two concerns.

The second thing is that in order to secure the maximum speed of production, and if possible some genuine competition as to price, the work should be spread among just as many competent producers as possible, and every contract so divided. If I understand correctly the intent of Congress, that was precisely what it was intended to bring about. I think we may as well admit that in spite of the fact that Congress has passed three or four bills in an attempt to bring about

the maximum possible saving of small business in this war that so far they have not done very much good. Recently we heard an announcement from the War Production Board to the effect that within a period of months a great number of small businesses will be deliberately deprived of their machinery and equipment, and that that will be concentrated in other hands. Such a move I want to say plainly and flatly has to be justified, if taken, on the very best possible grounds, on the ground that such a move is utterly necessary to the successful prosecution of the war. And if such a program is to be followed, the loss ought to be spread and carried by all industry and all the Nation, not just by some of these little fellows who are blotted out. In my judgment every one of these small businesses that may be put out of business through no fault of their own ought now to be compensated in some fair manner by means of War bonds or some other form of payment, or else there should be developed at once a program which can give absolute assurance to those businesses that when this war is finally won, they will be given a new lease on life and an opportunity to go ahead. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we shall confront a problem so serious that it may lead to great difficulty in perpetuating our so-called free economic system, for unless one has competition, unless one has a situation where there is more than one business in a given field, it is quite impossible to do that.

I for one am not ready to accept this death sentence to small business. The distinction ought not to be as between small and large businesses, but it should be as between capable and efficient business and unsuccessful and inefficient business. Sometimes that has not been the case. For example, I cannot understand why it should be necessary to deprive 138 firms of an opportunity to make certain items of clothing the Government is now ordering, and to concentrate all of that business in the hands of two firms. Neither can I understand why a tiny amount of steel to complete a steel producing plant should not be immediately granted by the War Production Board.

I am making this speech today because I want to say earnestly that I think monopoly is still a danger to our war effort, and that we have to recognize that fact. I have said over and over that I believe the dollar-a-year man idea is a mistake. I do not believe that governmental and public policy should be determined by people who are parties at interest. I think that many of the very men who are now in charge of many parts of this program are good men to do the job, but I certainly think they ought not to receive one cent of salary except from the Government Treasury.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes. I am glad to yield to my fine and earnest colleague from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has said he thinks monopoly is still a danger to our war effort.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do.

Mr. MURDOCK. Would not the gentleman be more nearly correct if he said that events today have aggravated monopoly, and that the danger is greatly enlarged through our war effort.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe very sincerely that the gentleman is correct. I believe that one of the things needed in connection with the prosecution of this war is for Congress, even as it considers the question of manpower mobilization to "draft" every patent there is in existence for the use and welfare of the Nation. For in my humble judgment patents are not yet being released as they should be for the use of all manufacturers. I think that technical and scientific information, all matters of that kind, have to be thrown open for use by anyone who can make use of them at the present time for production in connection with the war. In some cases the people whose past and present connections are with the great corporations of this country in a certain field, oil, steel or whatnot, are the very people who make decisions in regard to those commodities in the War Production Board, and under those circumstances those gentlemen should lean over backward and we should insist that they do so, to make certain that if little businesses are not given contracts or an opportunity to live, it is only because those businesses are really of no benefit to the war, and not in any case because it may present a challenge to monopolistic control.

Great credit is due to the really great accomplishments that have been made by the people who have organized our war production program. I give that credit freely. But to some degree, at least, an inner circle of our great corporations have held sufficient influence to bring about this concentration of the great bulk of war business in the hands of only a few concerns. I am convinced this is a source of weakness and not of strength. Whole orders are still sometimes given to one or two concerns when that is not really necessary.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield. Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Does not the gentleman think it significant that the chairman of the General Electric Co. retired from the War Production Board and was promoted to go to England, and that he drew a salary of \$10,000 a month, and that immediately following the Chairman of the War Production Board placed as his assistant the president of the General Electric Co., Mr. Wilson?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What the gentleman has to say is an illustration of what this problem is that I am trying to point out.

I make no charge against any individuals as not having done the job the best way they know how, but I do say that a man who has been schooled all his life in the experience of dealing with a great corporate structure, has to be caught up from time to time by somebody who has the nerve to say that the eyes of America are upon him, and to make certain that he follows exclusively the welfare of this whole Nation and

gives an opportunity to his competitors to participate in helping America win this war. I believe that the truth is that even such outstanding producers as Mr. Higgins, of New Orleans, and Henry Kaiser, of the Pacific coast, just do not belong to the inner circle I have mentioned, and that that is one reason that in certain cases they have had difficulty in being able to go forward with their production as fast as they should have, could have, and were eager to do.

And now I come to another theme.

America is not going to lose this war. America is going to win the war. It is not the function of the Congress to try to decide military questions. We must have and we do have confidence in our military commanders and leaders, though we may wish most earnestly for more unification and centralization of command.

But as to groups of people in our population—all groups, labor, farmers, businessmen, politicians, everyone—I think they have to think about their position with regard to our country today in the light of a story that I am sure you are all familiar with. It is a story about three men who were working on a cathedral. The first man was asked, as he used his hammer and chisel on the stone, "What are you doing?" He said, "I am making 2 shillings a day." The second man was asked, as he was using his hammer and chisel on precisely the same kind of a job, "What are you doing?" And he answered, "I am chipping this stone so it will be in proper shape." The third man was asked what he was doing when he was doing the same job, and he stood up, and his face lit up, and he said, "I am building a cathedral." That third man's spirit is the kind of spirit that can win this war, the kind of spirit that can win the peace after this war. It must be a spirit in which every group, every person, especially in a position of public trust, uses his job and his work not as an opportunity for his own advancement or an opportunity for padding his own pocket-book—and I say that, regardless of whether it be capital, labor, or anybody else—but as an opportunity to produce more of the things that America needs to fight this battle for freedom; more of the food that is necessary to feed the nations of this world, or to furnish more of the business executive ability without which we cannot possibly carry on the war, as everybody knows. It is not a case of who gets the contract, after all, so much as it is a case of whether the things are produced that America needs.

All I have had to say is with that idea in mind.

Finally, I want to say one more thing, and that is that in my judgment it is only a profound and vital religious faith that can carry people through the fire and tragedy of a time like this. War brings out the worst and the best in people. It breeds hate inevitably; it also causes millions of plain people, unheralded and unsung, to perform acts of completely unselfish heroism and sacrifice. It gives the world the heroism of the private soldiers and the greed of the racketeer and profiteer. It leads some to see only an opportunity to take advantage of their

fellow man, even of their nation, whereas in others it produces a love of country deeper than they have ever known before. The suffering and sacrifices of war either cause people to see a far deeper meaning to life than they have seen before, or else it destroys all that is best in them. The first of these things must happen. It is not enough to do honor to the men who bear the burden and heat of the battle and to make heroes of them. It is not enough to resolve to defeat the evil forces against which we fight. It will only suffice if we look without fear upon the vision of a new day—a day in which God's will will be done as never before on earth. And that means a day of greater brotherhood, a day of greater mercy, a day of greater concern for the welfare of the poor and the oppressed.

It is required of us today that each bear his share of the burden of this war. It will be required of us tomorrow that we be not either afraid or ashamed of the principles of the Kingdom of God on earth and that we build a world on the rock of cooperation in which monopoly will no longer bar the door of business opportunity to the little man, in which no returning soldier, nor his father nor his brother nor his son will seek in vain for work and constructive employment, in which no farmer will lose his farm because he has tilled the soil too skillfully and produced too bounteous a harvest. It will be required of us tomorrow that we build a world in which nation will not rise against nation; in which a lasting peace will prevail. No less than this will do. No less than a profoundly religious ideal about the whole struggle is worthy of us or of our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after other special orders of the day are disposed of I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS IN WASHINGTON

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, quite naturally I am a very happy man today. Last February 3 I started a movement here in the city of Washington to clean house in the Government departments in the matter of their wartime employment. I have since been joined by Senators, other Members of Congress, and newspaper men in a movement which has literally "smoked them out" and exposed the deplorable conditions that have been holding up our war effort right here in the heart of our Nation and the heart of the Allies' war effort. Conditions that call for investigation and proper remedial procedures have been ex-

posed. The passage of the Ramspeck resolution has climaxed my efforts. Yesterday when I asked for my special order I did not know the Ramspeck resolution would come up today, but I shall proceed to give the facts which I had assembled for this talk anyway, in the hope they will only spur on the investigators and expedite remedial measures to alleviate the situation.

The first person I want to quote who got "on the beam" after I initiated this movement to investigate employment conditions was none other than the one and only Dorothy Thompson. I want to quote from an article written by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on April 6, 1942:

In Washington it is difficult to see the woods for the trees. \* \* \*

The free agencies are increasing like guinea pigs. They have been set up without knowing exactly what they were set up for. \* \* \*

We have these agencies—and how are they staffed? Why many of the people in Washington should be in the responsible places they are remains a complete mystery to me, for their qualifications for the particular job are conspicuously absent. \* \* \*

The various information departments are in a complete tangle, and anything may come out of them except information. \* \* \*

Instead of this, they turn out pamphlets, leaflets, and mimeographed sheets enough to fill warehouses, while calling on the public to save paper. \* \* \*

They hastily enlarge their staffs in order to prove that they are very big and important; they hire press agents to tell the world so—which is one form of information, I suppose. \* \* \*

Washington seems to think that 200 people with 400 telephones and acres of office space can accomplish more than one person in a quiet room with one telephone. \* \* \*

But when you try to find out what all this business and strain is about, you find it is concentrated on getting the final twentieth initial on a memorandum proposing something that is never going to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I made a similar charge on the floor of the House 8 months ago. A charge that if we would reduce the personnel in Washington we would get along much faster with our war effort, we would alleviate the necessity of spending millions of dollars and using thousands of tons of critical material to build houses for war workers and transportation facilities to carry these war workers between their homes and their jobs. If this were done, those remaining would have a much healthier environment in which to live and, therefore, could do their jobs better.

Further quoting Miss Thompson:

You could not get the beds made in a private house with the sort of set-up we have at present. We are overstaffed and overorganized. We do not need more coordinators; we need some brooms.

Another person I wish to quote is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, from Virginia. I quote from the September issue of the Reader's Digest:

While Americans fight for their lives and pay to the hilt, Government spendthrifts toss away \$2,000,000,000 a year on bands, publicity, pork-barrel projects, and Treasury leeches. How can we stop it?

While you and all other patriotic Americans are practicing strict economy, making sacrifices to help win the war, your Government is wasting billions of dollars of the



taxpayers' money. Geared to high-speed spending in peacetime, Washington in wartime continues to pour out money as furiously for nonessentials as it does for battleships, planes, and tanks.

Certain groups are determined to carry on their spending for unemployment and for relief, whether it is needed or not. Others want to keep their cultural projects running. Still others would continue pork-barrel spending, such as unnecessary dams, roads, buildings, canals, and power projects. There is a tendency to hang on to every Government employee, whether he is busy or idle.

Here's an example of the way your money is being wasted: In February, this year, a Work Projects Administration representative in West Virginia asked for \$123,747 to organize bands, choruses, and orchestras among Work Projects Administration workers, to teach those who couldn't play, to furnish bull fiddles and bass drums to those who hadn't any. This, the representative declared, was "war morale work"; the Work Projects Administration folks would play and sing and make civilians want to buy more bonds.

The Work Projects Administration in Washington didn't say "no" to this application for \$123,747. Incredibly, it said, "That isn't enough. You can spend, in West Virginia alone, up to \$405,107."

Scores of Work Projects Administration bands, choruses, and orchestras have been engaged in this "war morale work." If other States were getting as much as West Virginia in proportion to their population \$26,000,000 will be spent for fiddling while the world burns.

There is no real need for Government employees in these nonessential activities to speed along full-tilt crying, "Keep 'Em Rolling!"—the "Em" in this instance referring to dollars, rolling out of the pockets of taxpayers to support these employees and the millions of clients who are still receiving what some call charity in one form or another from the "U. S. Government."

If there were only some way to take a few thousand key Government employees—directors, assistant directors, and publicity purveyors—show them the newspaper headlines, and say: "Now, look, please. See that word? W-A-R spells war. You surely know what a war is. Well, there's a war going on, a very, very big war. We're in it up to our necks, and so far we haven't won it. This is not time for monkey business. Come on and get into the war with the rest of the country."

We are meeting strong resistance. Men and women in high places excitedly contend that social gains must advance unabated in wartime and that nonessential spending must be continued so that these agencies will come out of the war full of vim and vigor and with the spending habit unimpaired. The beneficiaries of Government bounties clamor for their continuance. Urging them on are thousands of Government field employees who have been known to use Government money to pay for propaganda to attack our committee.

Almost everybody who works in a non-essential Government position has convinced himself, and attempts to convince others, that we can't fight a good war if he loses his job. Straight-faced, they contend fiercely that to win the war it is necessary to lend money to operate schools to teach cultural subjects to adults, and to produce booklets telling how to put on a church supper and what to wear when you attend.

It's all in the interest of building morale, they declare. But America's morale doesn't need to be built. If there is any morale problem, it has been created by the practices of these morale builders. Stop wasteful spending and nobody will have to worry about morale in this country.

They have been spending money feebly to build morale when the very fact

that they are spending the money contributed by these patriotic citizens to buy bonds and stamps is in itself destroying the morale of the country.

A clipping from a Kansas City newspaper points out that, while the Office of Civilian Defense has no money for gas masks, it was able to spend \$124,000 for publicity. Washington's output of publicity is unbelievable. Nearly every agency has a staff of information specialists. Ninety million dollars a year is spent to send out news to boost various departments and their heads.

The Treasurer of the United States says he will need \$1,700,000 in the coming year just to meet the costs of paying checks issued by other Government agencies.

A few days spent in some Washington offices would make any taxpayer go mad. Nobody seems to hesitate before he makes a long-distance telephone call nor appears to hurry while it is in progress. The National Youth Administration alone spent \$262,892 for long-distance calls in a year. Patriotic Federal employees have written their Congressmen letters which include charges such as these.

I have here about 500 letters which I have selected from several thousand that I have received from patriotic Government employees protesting the deplorable conditions to which Senator BYRD refers.

An investigation would disclose that in many of the older departments, the Internal Revenue, General Accounting, Agriculture, etc., one-third of the personnel could be dropped and better work would be accomplished.

Without exaggeration, 70 percent of the girls have nothing to do all day. We may be lucky to get one letter a day to retype, and we may not. But we are told to write personal letters or do something else to appear busy.

This Nation is in dire peril. We can win only if every one of us realizes that his own safety is threatened, that he must make great sacrifices to save himself and his country. He must stop saying "Gimme" and declare "I will give." The top men in Washington who wantonly waste money are sabotaging our national effort as much as the spy who puts a bomb under a bridge. In every town and city, in every office in Washington, Americans should rise and protest when they see evidences of Government waste.

In Washington thousands of men and women are working effectively and unselfishly—fighting as patriotically as the men on the firing line. But there are thousands, too, who have the "Washington mind"—the political mind, the "gimme" mind, the reckless spending mind. They are a drag on the war effort. The "Washington mind" must be destroyed.

Then I want to quote from the *Courier-Journal*, Louisville, Ky., September 5, 1942, a column by Frank R. Kent:

Now, no one in the administration, except for purely propaganda purposes, contends that the war management is nearly as competent as it should be. Those in position to have a detached view know that its inefficiency is almost incredible; that the confusion is beyond description and that, compared to its size and effort, the results are shockingly small.

Why? Why is this war less well managed than the last one? Why is the proportionate waste greater and why are the results less satisfactory? Why are things, generally, in the kind of mess that was avoided last time? There are two obvious answers. One is that in this war we have failed to profit by the experience of the last one. We have disregarded its lessons and repeated its blunders.

But there is another reason even more basic. It consists of the really absurd, not to say terrifying, overmanning of the war machine. The extent to which this has been done is unprecedented and indefensible. It is the real reason the organization functions so feebly. It is the real reason it bogs down in so many places. There are in Washington today many thousands of people connected with the Government who should not be here. There are 50,000 or 60,000 men and women on the pay roll who not only have no useful work to do but who interfere with others who have.

Not long ago, a wise and patriotic man, who has been here for a long time at considerable sacrifice, was informally conferring with a half dozen administration aides. Everybody agreed that things were in a pretty bad state.

"Conceding," this man was asked, "that the mess is not only bad but dangerous, what would you do, if you had the power to straighten things out?"

"Well," was the thoughtful reply, "the first thing I would do would be to go through every department and agency and reduce personnel 70 percent, not in the interests of economy but solely in the interests of efficiency."

It is significant that after some hesitation, everyone in the group agreed with him. The fact is that that remark went to the root of the trouble. No informed man possibly could disagree. Even if no more brains were taken in, if personnel was reduced 70 percent efficiency would be increased 100 percent.

There are here thousands of men busily undoing the work of other thousands. There are many more thousands whose work exactly duplicates that of as many more thousands—or conflicts with it. There are many more thousands with little or nothing to do who find themselves in contact with similar thousands who have just as little to do but have been here longer. This immense overmanning is the real menace to our safety. It is the real reason the full power and resources of the Nation are not being made to count. It is the greatest threat to ultimate victory because it spells impotency.

But what is to be done about it? Reduction in personnel is the imperative need of the hour. Yet, who is to give the order? That can come from the White House only. And for 10 years Mr. Roosevelt's tendency has been strongly toward expansion, never toward contraction. His practice has been never to drop anyone. When changes were forced, new men were put over the old men, but the old men still stayed on the pay roll. This has been carried to a perilous and appalling length. No finer thing could happen than for the President to realize all this and issue directives that would contract this horribly swollen and utterly unmanageable organization into something that could be operated with ordinary intelligence.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman stated he could reduce the number of employees in the Government and maintain 100-percent efficiency in the departments.

Mr. WILSON. I beg your pardon. Increase efficiency 100 percent. However, I was quoting.

Mr. PATMAN. Now, let us take the gentleman's own office.

Mr. WILSON. The gentleman asked me to yield for a question.

Mr. PATMAN. This is a question. Could the gentleman afford to reduce the number of employees in his office 70 percent and increase its efficiency?

Mr. WILSON. I could not reduce the employees in my office.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman think the people in the Government have the same reason to keep the number of employees that they have? If the gentleman cannot reduce his, how can he expect them to reduce theirs?

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman let me answer his question now?

Mr. PATMAN. Surely.

Mr. WILSON. I defy anyone to go to my office morning or night, or to check all day long, and if my staff is not operating 100 percent efficiently, if it is not operating as efficiently as any staff on Capitol Hill, then I will eat my words. They are working, and efficiently. But I am quoting someone else in regard to the city of Washington. I am not saying I agree with the figures entirely, although I agree in part. I originally brought this subject before the House last February. I had noticed the trend. The gentleman has noticed it. Every honest Member of Congress has noticed it. However, we may differ on the degree of inefficiency and overstaffing.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield for another question, does he not believe that when he makes charges like that he should present some proof so that Congress can do something about it?

Mr. WILSON. I have the proof.

Mr. PATMAN. They are just letters, I understand.

Mr. WILSON. They are letters from Government workers. If they are liars, that is further proof that they are inefficient and incompetent and should not be on the Federal pay roll.

That is enough. I decline to yield further.

Mr. PATMAN. What has the gentleman done to stop it? I want to ask him one other question about the N. Y. A.

Mr. WILSON. I introduced a resolution last February asking for a committee to determine and report the facts with recommendations.

Mr. PATMAN. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WILSON. All right; remember, it is a poor rule that does not work both ways. There will be points of order all the way along if the gentleman does that. "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."

Mr. PATMAN. I just want the gentleman to yield once more.

Mr. WILSON. Let me have the gentleman's question.

Mr. PATMAN. The N. Y. A. was accused of spending \$270,000 in 1 year for long-distance telephone calls. The gentleman knows that some of those calls were necessary.

Mr. WILSON. Absolutely.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not unfair to make charges about this certain amount just because it is a large amount and say it is wrong, without pointing out the part that is not justified and the part that is justified? Why does not the gentleman put in the Record the part that is justified and that which is unjustified?

Mr. WILSON. Does the gentleman believe I could do that in an hour, a day, or a week?

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman cannot do that he should not make the charge.

Mr. WILSON. I was quoting an authority. He did not say it was all wasted, he merely told how much they spent. The gentleman's question is ridiculous and absurd.

Mr. PATMAN. Not as much as the gentleman's statement.

Mr. WILSON. No one would charge that every nickel spent for Western Union service or for telephone calls in a department is a waste. No one has attempted to make that charge. The gentleman was just drawing an ambiguous conclusion.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Let us take one or two specific items. If the gentleman does not know it, he might be advised that the House not long ago permitted an appropriation to go through to spend \$57,000 to study the food habits of wild birds. Does the gentleman feel that that is necessary to the prosecution of the war?

Mr. PATMAN rose.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not asking the gentleman from Texas, I am addressing the question to the gentleman who has the floor.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not question any specific item the gentleman mentions, but I presume he was on the floor at that time to point them out. The gentleman represents the great minority in this House. I wonder if a concerted effort was made to defeat this appropriation that the gentleman says was unnecessary and harmful? I do not know whether or not it was.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I can advise the gentleman that if he will examine the Record he will find that I offered an amendment to strike that particular item from the bill. The gentleman who asked the question neither was on the floor at the time nor did he attempt in any way to help me out on that proposal.

Let me proceed further, since I have opened the question.

There was in that same bill an item providing for the expenditure of money to continue a Travel Bureau in this Government. The distinguished gentleman, with all the authority and all the power he has on the majority side of the House, did not help on that particular item, either, and that item also stayed in the bill.

Continuing further for the moment, I bring up these two items simply as examples, and to say that while the gentleman from Indiana, who has the floor, probably has not pointed out specific items to satisfy the gentleman from Texas, I am pointing to items which I think are examples of extravagance and waste on the part of this Government. I am not here to say that all expenses are bad. However, the gentleman asked for a couple of specific items, and because the gentleman from Indiana, who has the floor, probably at the moment could not point to a specific item, I pointed out two items. I objected to those items and

tried to strike them from the bill, but I could not get the job done. If the gentleman from Texas had been on the floor and had helped me out, I am sure both the items would have been stricken and we would have saved the money.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield to me briefly?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; for a moment or two, and then I want to conclude my remarks.

Mr. PATMAN. I commend the gentleman from Kansas for being on the alert and trying to stop anything he considered to be a wrongful appropriation. I commend him, too, for pointing out what he believes to be a waste of public funds. It happens that I am not familiar with the part that he refers to. I hope the gentleman from Indiana is just as specific and that other people who criticize will be just as specific as the gentleman from Kansas about pointing out, No. 1, so much, No. 2, so much. But if you add together the two complaints of the gentleman from Kansas, they would not amount to over a few cents per \$1,000,000 of the money we have appropriated. Of course, even that should be saved if it is wastefully and needlessly spent. We should save every dime we can.

I commend the gentleman, but at the same time we should not make a blanket charge just because we spent \$270,000 on long-distance calls. We should not try to impugn somebody's motives for that. We should separate that amount and show the part that should be spent and the part that should not be spent.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to continue for a little while, anyway, without interruption. I am going to change my routine here and point out to the distinguished gentleman from Texas a few specific cases where money has been wasted.

First, I will go back to my home district. I am a member of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee of the House and we have had men come before our committee and state that we should authorize an appropriation of seven or eight or nine billion dollars to build houses for defense workers in the United States averaging around \$6,500 per house, stating that anybody making less than \$2,000 per year is a poor risk and that the Government should build a house in which he can live.

This is the testimony and this places 98 percent of our Indiana high school teachers who are required to have a master's degree to teach in the State, in the category of being a poor risk after they have spent thousands of dollars and years of their life to get their educations. Imagine them paying taxes to build houses for people who have spent nothing for their educations and are making twice as much money.

Now I am going to deviate from my regular order to point out some specific cases for the gentleman. Just the other day we were asked to authorize the appropriation of \$600,000,000, an amount equivalent to the total amount appropriated under the Lanham Act to that date, and I happened, I think, to be the only one who opposed that authorization in



the committee. I opposed it here on the House floor, but I was not granted sufficient time to make adequate explanation of previous expenditures.

To be specific, I will quote from the Truman report, No. 480, part 5, pages 107, 108, 109:

At Gadsden, Ala., the project consists of 250 units and is limited to housing Army and civilian employees at the Gadsden ordnance plant. As of January 2, 1942, 150 units were available and 38 units occupied.

We have built 150 units, and there was supposed to be a demand of 5 or 6 people for every house built, but out of those 150 only 38 were occupied, although all of them became available on September 18, 1941. The coordinator's report of May 2, 1941, indicated a need for housing by June 1, 1941. Imagine we have built 150 units, and yet only 38 of those have been occupied. Gentlemen, I am quoting from the Truman committee report.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I would like to finish this first, and then I shall yield.

Fort Ord, Calif.: This project, consisting of 264 units, is intended to house Army civilian and enlisted personnel. And as of January 2, 1942, only 124 units out of 264 were occupied, although all units were available on December 6, 1941.

Only 124 out of 264 units and yet you charge me with the responsibility of pointing out to you where the Government has been wasting money, where they have paid coordinators who did not know how to coordinate, men who did not know what it was all about. Is this not an example of gross inefficiency and incompetency?

San Francisco, Calif.: This project, consisting of 75 units, is intended to house Army enlisted and civilian personnel, engaged in harbor defense of San Francisco. Although all units were available on September 15, 1941, as of January 2, 1942, only 40 have been occupied.

And yet you challenge me with the responsibility of pointing out specific cases of waste and incompetency.

Riverside, Calif.—

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I want to correct a statement the gentleman made.

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. With respect to the Gadsden proposition, which you cited there, the ordnance plant was not completed until late in the spring of this year.

Mr. WILSON. But they found a need for the housing months before.

Mr. MANASCO. You do not think it a wise idea to have the houses built there for the workers to live in when the machines are there for them to operate?

Mr. WILSON. They claim the need must exist at the actual time the project is initiated. Continuing—

Riverside, Calif.: This project, consisting of 150 units, is intended to house Army enlisted and civilian personnel stationed at March Field.

Although all units were available on August 8, 1941, as of January 2, 1942, only 71 had been occupied. According

to the housing manager, the need may have been overestimated.

There were 150 units, and only 75 of them occupied.

Next comes San Diego, with 3,000 units, and months later only 2,240 had been occupied. Imagine 760 idle homes, squandered money, and critical materials.

San Rafael, Calif., a project of 175 units, and months later only 141 occupied.

Sunnyvale, Calif., a project consisting of 150 units, and months afterward only 60 units occupied.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Since the gentleman has been proven to be mistaken in one case, and if the cases are all similar, could not the gentleman be mistaken in all of these others?

Mr. WILSON. The gentleman has not been proven to be mistaken in any sense of the word. I thought the gentleman from Texas was honest and a good American citizen, working in the interest of better prosecution of the war and for efficiency in government, and here he is standing up defending inefficiency and incompetency when I am pointing out facts in quotations from the Truman report.

Mr. PATMAN. I am asking the gentleman to point them out, so that it will be helpful. Anybody can criticize.

Mr. WILSON. May I say to the gentleman I pointed out nothing but facts as reported by good, honest Democrats, who do not believe in New Deal bungling of the war effort and who put patriotism ahead of petty politics. Next we take Jacksonville, Fla., with 330 units, and only 259 occupied.

These show how we are wasting our critical materials, while the boys in service need tanks and guns. We are building houses for the comfort of individuals, who never move into them, and then the gentleman from Texas has the temerity to stand up and challenge me and ask me to point out specific cases.

Miami, Fla., a project of 200 units, and only 9 units occupied months later.

Tallahassee, Fla., a project of 100 units, and months after only 37 units occupied.

West Palm Beach, Fla., 150 units, and only 59 occupied months after; Macon, Ga., 250 units, and only 32 occupied.

Mr. Speaker, I am tired of reading all of these items individually. I think I have convinced those who could be convinced that I have some specific cases which I have pointed out. I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to insert other projects in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Boise, Idaho: This project consists of 100 units for Army enlisted and civilian employees stationed at the Army air base. Although all units were available on May 30, 1941, as of January 2, 1942, only 77 units had been occupied. As of September 29, 1941, 83 units were occupied, so the demand is decreasing instead of increasing.

Louisville, Ky.: This project consists of 250 units for Army enlisted and civilian personnel stationed at Camp Taylor. The first

unit was available on October 22, 1941, and all units were available on November 14, 1941. As of January 2, 1942, only 150 units have been occupied.

Bossier City, La.: This project, consisting of 139 units for Army enlisted and civilian employees stationed at Barksdale Field has been available for occupancy since September 23, 1941. As of January 2, 1942, only 52 units have been occupied. As of September 29, 1941, 24 units had been occupied. The Coordinator's reports of February 27, 1941, indicated a need by April 1, 1941.

Havre de Grace, Md.: This project, consisting of 500 units, is intended to house Army civilian workers employed at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds. All units were available on November 14, 1941. As of January 2, 1942, only 226 have been occupied.

Mount Clements, Mich.: This project, consisting of 130 units, is intended to house Army enlisted and civilian personnel stationed at Selfridge Field. Some units were available on May 12, 1941, and all units were available on July 5, 1941. As of January 2, 1942, only 62 units are occupied. On September 29, 1941, 103 units were occupied. The vacancy ratio thus is increasing rather than decreasing.

Pedricktown, N. J.: This project of 100 units is intended for Army civilian workers employed at the Delaware ordnance depot. All units were available on October 17, but as of January 2, 1942, only 54 have been occupied.

Albuquerque, N. Mex.: This project, consisting of 100 units, is intended to house Army enlisted and civilian personnel stationed at the Army air base. All units were available on April 4, 1941. As of January 2, 1942, only 70 have been occupied.

Lackawanna, N. Y.: This project, consisting of 200 units, is intended to house civilian industrial workers. All units were available on November 15, 1941, but as of January 2, 1942, only 45 have been occupied.

Sidney, N. Y.: This project of 200 units is intended to house civilian industrial workers. As of November 14, 1941, all units were available; as of January 2, 1942, only 110 have been occupied.

Wilmington, N. C.: Projects 31021 and 31203, consisting of 374 units, are intended to house industrial workers employed at the Wilmington shipyard. All units were available September 6, 1941, but as of January 2, 1942, only 275 units have been occupied.

Warren, Ohio: This project, consisting of 200 units, is intended to house Army civilian workers. All units were available on August 8, 1941, but as of January 2, 1942, only 105 have been occupied. The Coordinator's report of June 21, 1941, indicated a need by July 1, 1941.

Wickford, R. I.: This project, consisting of 262 units, is intended to house naval enlisted personnel stationed at the Quonset Point air base. All units were available on November 28, 1941, with the first units available on September 8, 1941. As of January 2, 1942, only 52 have been occupied. The Coordinator's report of December 31, 1940, indicated a need by April 1, 1941.

Charleston, S. C.: This project, consisting of 350 prefabricated, demountable units, is intended for Army and civilian workers employed at the ordnance depot. Some units were available on September 15, 1941, and all units were available on November 8, 1941. As of January 2, 1942, only 142 units have been occupied.

Corpus Christi, Tex.: This project, consisting of 400 units, is intended for naval enlisted personnel stationed at the naval air station. Although all units were available on October 3, 1941, only 199 units have been occupied as of January 2, 1942.

Dumas, Tex.: This project of 100 units is intended to house industrial workers employed at the zinc plant. Although all units

were available on August 15, 1941, as of January 2, 1942, only 70 units have been occupied. The Coordinator's report of April 21, 1941, indicated a need by May 1, 1941.

Houston, Tex.: This project of 200 units is intended to house Army enlisted and civilian personnel. All units were available on July 11, 1941, but as of January 2, 1942, only 124 units have been occupied.

Langley Field, Va.: This project of 350 units is intended to house Army enlisted and civilian personnel stationed at Langley Field. All units were available on September 26, 1941, but as of January 2, 1942, only 122 units have been occupied.

Manitowoc, Wis.: This project consists of 400 units for industrial workers. All units were available on November 21, 1941, but as of January 2, 1942, only 46 have been occupied.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. One of the great reasons for having this investigation is that it will show where the workers now in the Government can be released, so that they may go into the war industries and actually assist in the winning of the war. It seems to me that is one of the most vital things we have before us today. We cannot lose an hour in filling those industries.

Mr. WILSON. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Now I shall quote Senator "COTTON ED" SMITH from an interview written up in the Washington News. He says "we are in one hell of a mess." "COTTON ED," you know, is a good old Jeffersonian Democrat and lacks a hell of a lot of being a new dealer.

WE'RE IN ONE HELL OF A MESS—CURTAILED, "LOWS" "COTTON ED" TILL WE HAVE NO TAIL TO CUR

Senator "COTTON ED" SMITH, of South Carolina, having made a serious study of world problems, concluded today that "We are in one hell of a mess—right smack dab in the middle of a jackass age."

SMITH shook his head sadly, pulled on his walrus moustache, and allowed as how:

"Congress has detailed powers to the administration until we no longer have any 'tail to do.'"

"The administration has curtailed production of cotton until the country no longer has any tail to cur."

"If there could be anything worse the matter with us, I don't know what it could be."

Just returned to the Capital after a 6-week fishing trip to his home State, SMITH elaborated on his conclusions as follows:

"We are in one hell of a mess because we haven't paid attention to what has been going on behind our backs. Here the administration has suddenly sneaked up behind us, stuck a gun to our heads, and said: 'By October 1 or your life.' Now, how can anybody concentrate on legislation to stabilize the cost of living or anything else with somebody bigger than they are threatening them all the time?"

"My God, but we are in one hell of a mess! We are right smack dab in the middle of a jackass age. For many years I have been advocating a return to the horse-and-buggy days. Now we have sunk below even that. We have now reached the jackass, spelled j-a-c-k-a-s-s, age. A return to the horse-and-buggy days would certainly be an improvement over the mess we are in now. If they don't drive us to the horse and buggy with gasoline rationing, maybe we can get there some other way."

He bit off a chew of tobacco, leaned back in his chair, shook his head sadly, waved his

hand, and indicated that the interview was over.

"But Senator, don't you think there is some good somewhere?" the reporter asked.

"You're damned right there's some good, but it's not in the administration."

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I am sorry that I cannot yield. My time is short. Next, I am quoting Senator WHEELER in the Washington Times-Herald of September 24. Senator WHEELER is quoted as saying:

Someone has got to take these various bureaucrats and knock their heads together.

Returning from the West, Mr. WHEELER ridiculed stories that the people are complacent over the war. The people, he said, feel that Washington is complacent.

Why would they not be, when they are right here in the middle of it all and get their information first-hand?

"Ever since 1932 we have had one emergency after another, and we haven't won any of them, but we are in a war emergency now which we must win," Senator WHEELER said.

#### PUBLIC AROUSED

"The people in the West, however, are very much disturbed by the tremendous waste and extravagance in the various Government activities. It is so evident that the people in every community know it and talk about it. It is having a depressing effect on the sale of bonds and stamps."

"Matters of waste and extravagance were called to my attention in connection with some Government projects which seem incredible. But in some instances proof has been called to my attention."

"The people of the West and Middle West have been criticized for complacency, but they feel that the complacency is with the bureaus in Washington. Statements are issued one day by one department and contradicted the next day by another."

#### INEXCUSABLE WASTE

"The people realize that when you go from a peacetime to a wartime economy you are bound to have some inefficiency, but they feel what is taking place now is inexcusable."

"Farmers are asking why it is we permitted the sale of scrap iron, oil, gasoline, and copper to Japan, and then waited until 8 months after war was declared before we put on a drive to collect scrap iron for the United States."

"Someone has got to take these bureaucrats and knock their heads together."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman is making a serious charge and he is absolutely mistaken about it.

Mr. WILSON. I did not make any charge at all. I was quoting a United States Senator.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has 1 hour and I think he should yield.

Mr. WILSON. I do not have an hour. I beg your pardon. I did have 1 hour when I started.

Mr. PATMAN. I wonder if the gentleman would not yield on a question where he is positively mistaken?

Mr. WILSON. I am not mistaken about anything. I was quoting Senator WHEELER.

Mr. PATMAN. I will not insist on the point of order.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I do not yield.

"My own view is that if we had not created the new bureaus, but had let the old departments handle many of our problems we would have been far better off."

WHEELER said that the creation of new bureaus, with thousands of new employees, which must be trained from the start, has created difficulties which could have been avoided had the old bureaus been expanded.

I am going to quote now from a publication, War Management in Washington, published by the Citizens Bureau Government Research, Inc., New York State:

#### THE CRITICISM OF THE WAR MANAGEMENT

John O'Donnell in New York News: "Washington correspondents who covered World War No. 1 here in the Capital are frankly saying that the bewilderment and disorganization of today's war administration surpasses anything under the regime of Wilson."

Frank R. Kent in the Baltimore Sun: " \* \* \* its inefficiency is almost incredible; \* \* \* the confusion is beyond description; \* \* \* the results are shockingly small."

Walter Lippman: " \* \* \* the people are not being told the truth, are not being made to realize the gravity and the humiliation of what is happening, are being fed on pap by the officeholders and bureaucrats who lack the imagination and the will power to meet a crisis with extraordinary measures. \* \* \* The cure is the fear of God put into them by the voice of the people."

"The things men complain about come from the refusal of the President to make a genuine war cabinet for reaching his decisions and the enforcement of discipline."

Prominent Washington newsletters, not customarily given to vehement criticism, have forcefully called attention to the ineptitude of many of the present officials, the disorganization of the war administration, and the delays in war production that these conditions have brought about.

David Lawrence: " \* \* \* the President is susceptible to pressure groups."

"Labor is given an amazing concession—its peacetime standard of living must not be impaired even in wartime."

" \* \* \* we are drifting into worse confusion."

Time Magazine: " \* \* \* the confusion, amateurism, divided authority, the lack of broad planning that characterized Washington last week."

"The Cabinet looked weak even in peacetime."

New York Herald Tribune said in an editorial: " \* \* \* what they (the public) sense is that there is something awry in the entire organization of the Nation's war effort. This has become more and more apparent with the passage of each month."

" \* \* \* administrative ineptitude."

Drew Pearson, long an administration supporter, said: "F. D. R. is too great a man to be pulled down into the gutters of history by the well-meaning bunglers around him, and democracy is too precious to be left in their fumbling hands."

Fortune Magazine, to the President: " \* \* \* your war administration as at present constituted is incapable of fighting a good war \* \* \* the inefficiencies of the present set-up are too dangerous for you to tolerate any longer. They are monstrous and the people are beginning to see the results."

Maj. Al Williams, aviation columnist: " \* \* \* We have everything except leadership."



Raymond Clapper: "It (the Baruch report) is important as a case study in bureaucratic fumbling \* \* \* in this arsenal of bureaucracy."

"Can we expect something better from here on out? \* \* \* That's the real challenge the Baruch report puts up to Washington."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PATMAN. I make the point of order that the gentleman should not read, without the permission of the House, what another says. I would like for him to yield for a question, if he will, because I think he left a mistaken impression awhile ago.

Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman mentioned about scrap. Now, that is an example of how mistaken the gentleman is. It is true that over a period of 18 months we let the Japanese buy about 5,000,000 tons of scrap. We have 90,000,000 tons a year of steel, but while we were doing that we were building up the largest rubber supply in all history, 700,000 tons.

If we had not let the Japs have a little scrap—little to us—we would not have had sufficient rubber to carry on our war machine for 2 years. So the gentleman was clearly in error in indicating that we were wrong in letting the Japs have any of that scrap.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me on the same point?

Mr. WILSON. Just a moment; I will yield to everyone if someone will get me additional time; otherwise I cannot yield. If you want to adjourn on me, go ahead and take me off the floor in that fashion. If you want to exercise that right go ahead and do so, but remember that I reserve the same right from now on.

Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I shall be delighted to let the gentleman have another hour.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will ask that the gentleman be given additional time.

Mr. WILSON. Get the time extended and I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana be allowed to continue for 1 additional hour after the other special orders that have already been entered are disposed of.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I decline to accept the conditions. I ask to have my time extended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BLAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not need to get the report of the Rules Committee; I was on the committee investigating it and know the reasons. I know that if we had not let Japan have a little scrap iron we would not have gotten tons of rubber.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I have not been given additional time

and therefore must continue with my statement.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Let the gentleman himself ask for additional time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. WILSON. Mark Sullivan said this:

I find myself saying "we" and "our" in some vague reluctance to place so tragic a blame (for the rubber situation) on individuals. But it is not a thing that all of us were responsible for. The responsibility was on the persons conducting our Government.

Under the conditions under which we were laboring and what was obvious to all of us that the President had in mind, no sane sensible man would say that we had an adequate rubber supply stored up at the time of Pearl Harbor. We have heard much about this word "appeasement." Regardless of how much we appeased we still do not have an adequate rubber supply stored up in comparison with what we should have had.

The Baruch-Conant-Compton report, giving those parts which reflect the general management of the war effort, has this to say:

(The situation is) so dangerous that unless corrective measures are taken immediately this country will face both a military and civilian collapse.

Mind you, that was the Baruch report. We face a military and civilian collapse if we do not do something and do it now. We have wasted 10 valuable months. So beginning 10 months late on this investigation of wartime Washington is about the administration's batting average.

General Somervell said:

We are losing the war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put the remainder of this in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have about 500 letters here that I selected out of many thousands I received from Government employees last February, testifying to the deplorable conditions that existed in Washington at that time. I made those statements public in the House of Representatives. The newspapers very graciously carried them to every corner of the United States. The people know of those conditions and I am thankful that this criticism has resulted in setting up of a committee to determine the facts. No one can be accused of being unpatriotic if he asks only for the facts. I have confidence in my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], that he will get us the facts.

I have not time to quote from many of these letters, but will pick out a few. The first one I pick up is from a Government employee, and from it I read the following:

Employees in one division of Securities are idle 50 percent of the time. Such a division can easily be abolished, thereby eliminating the salaries of the supervisor and assistant who never do a day's work.

An investigation is badly needed in the Division of Securities. Will you start the ball rolling and get some action? The interest of

a gentleman of your initiative can help a great deal. Your interest in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is asking unanimous consent to have the material he is reading inserted in the RECORD. I will have to insist that the names of the persons writing these things be inserted in the RECORD also.

Mr. WILSON. Of course, I do not care what you ask, as long as you have no way of getting it; it does not make any difference to me. If you do not want the truth, all right. Like all new dealers, you always want to hold the hammer over the head of somebody to prevent them from telling the truth. You intentionally try to hide, cover up, and thus encourage this gross inefficiency, which I have proven to be a drag on our war effort.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that these quotations cannot be inserted in the RECORD over an objection when they do not contain the names of the persons alleged to have written them.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the point of order. Every letter from which I am quoting is signed by the Government employee writing the letter.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it the intention of the gentleman to put the name of the person writing the letter in the RECORD?

Mr. WILSON. It is not.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then I object, unless the gentleman is willing to put the names of the authors of the letters in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not understand that there is a unanimous-consent request pending. There was a request made a short time ago for the insertion of certain papers in the RECORD. The Chair asked if there was objection, or stated "Without objection, it is so ordered" and there was no objection. There is no unanimous-consent request now pending.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order when he reads a purported letter without naming the person who is supposed to have written the letter.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not know of any such rule requiring a Member who is reading to state by whom the letter was written.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, if the Chair has not finally ruled, my understanding is that it is a violation of the rules of the House to read anything which is purported to come from another source without indicating the particular source from which it came.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not know of any such rule.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Has the Chair finally ruled?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not know of any such rule and, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is not proceeding in order because he is reading without unanimous consent of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It does not require unanimous consent, but if there is objection, the question will be put to the House.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is whether the gentleman will be permitted to read the statement.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the gentleman reading letters if he will give the names of the authors, but I do think that he should give the names of the persons who make the statements that he puts in the RECORD. I will not insist on the point of order, because I believe in an open, full, and free RECORD.

Mr. WILSON. Of course, the gentleman will not insist on that point of order, and I know why he will not insist on that point of order.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman does not have the floor right now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is hearing the gentleman from Texas on a point of order.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest and sincerely hope that the gentleman will give the House the benefit of the names of the people who are making these serious complaints.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not read the names of any Government employees who have written him.

Mr. WILSON. I certainly will not.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It would tend to intimidate Government employees and discourage them from writing to their Congressmen.

Mr. WILSON. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I inserted a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last February and a Government employee was fired the next day because her superior suspected her of writing the letter. However, I got the lady reinstated. That shows how desperate and vicious some of these supervisors are to build themselves up and to keep their useless jobs and big salaries.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I will not yield further. Here is a quotation from another letter:

I spent 19 years in the United States Government service—in the Treasury, Agriculture, War, and Interior Departments. In three different offices I had very little work and they were all headed by chiefs who tried to raise their own standard by having as many employees under them as possible. In the last office I worked, the chief was conscientious, hard working, but in constant fear that someone with more pull would get his job. The assistant chief had plenty of pull, received \$1,800 a year, and did nothing except answer a few telephone calls a day. Yet the

yearly report on her work covered a list of duties that were staggering. I wrote the report from dictation. She could easily have done my work and her own, too, yet, when I left another stenographer was appointed to take my place.

#### Further quoting:

The New Deal distributors have apparently been trying to solve the unemployment situation by putting everybody possible to work in Washington—or putting them on the pay roll in Washington.

Some years ago Congressman Blanton, of Texas, took up the issue of overstaffed offices—too many people to do the work required. He visited the work rooms of the departments and counted the idle seat warmers—40 girls in a room doing the work that 10 could easily have done. There is lots of that.

Young girls and boys going to Washington from the country towns are amazed at the little they have to do to earn big money. You can get no help in the departments. Every department head and supervisor wants more help—and resists efforts to reduce. The only way to get at it is through appropriations, and the Appropriations Committee is so busy with billion dollar items they have not time to bother about nickels and dimes.

The enclosed clipping is applicable to most of the offices of the Federal Government at the present time. Older employees who have served through the years are all appalled at the wanton waste of time, energy, and supplies that is the rule of today. No one dares to report the facts in a candid and honorable way. The aim seems to be complete subjugation of the population through induction in the armed forces or employment within the corporations now functioning as integral parts of the Federal Government.

I have so many of these letters here that I do not have time to read very many. Several are from certified public accountants. Some of them have been to my office and have told me of the situation. They have put it in writing and promised to come before any committee which will give them the protection they need to tell their story. Now that my time is practically up I cannot insert any more quotations at this time.

I do not see how any Member of Congress can stand on the floor of this House and defend such a deplorable condition. Some have intentionally tried to disrupt my speech to prevent me exposing these facts to the people of the Nation. The people will always be suspicious of those who disrupt a speech designed to bring to them information about bottlenecks in our war effort, and especially will they be suspicious of those who shield waste and extravagance and thus prolong the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### AMENDMENT OF THE HATCH ACT

Mr. HOBBS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2471) to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to its application to officers and employees of educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, and cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, commonly known as the Hatch Act:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2471) to amend the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to its application to officers and employees of educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, and cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, commonly known as the Hatch Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1 and 2 and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 3, for the reason that the conferees are of the unanimous opinion that nothing in the Hatch Act interdicts any person from expressing his opinion on any political subject or candidate.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,  
SAM HOBBS,  
JOHN W. GWYNNE,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

WALTER F. GEORGE,  
CARL A. HATCH,  
WARREN R. AUSTIN,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2471) to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to its application to officers and employees of educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, and cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, commonly known as the Hatch Act, submit the following explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon in conference, and recommend in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment is merely clerical. The Senate agrees to the substitution of section number "21" for "22".

Amendment No. 2: This amendment is to clarify the fact that the proposed exemption from section 9 is limited to "9 (a)" and "9 (b)" and does not refer to "9A". The Senate recedes from its disagreement to this amendment.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment provided that nothing contained in sections 2, 9, or 12 should be deemed to prohibit any bona fide editor and owner of a weekly or semiweekly newspaper with a circulation not exceeding 5,000 from expressing his own opinion in his own newspaper. The House recedes from this amendment for the reason that the conferees are of the unanimous opinion that nothing in the Hatch Act interdicts any person from expressing his opinion on any political subject or candidate.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,  
SAM HOBBS,  
JOHN W. GWYNNE,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill S. 2471.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?



Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has not the conference report been printed?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It has not been printed. It has just been ordered printed.

Mr. MICHENER. What are the details of it? It is rather unusual to consider a conference report in this manner. I am in favor of what has been done, but I do not want the report to go through in such an unusual manner without some explanation.

Mr. HOBBS. The Senate receded on our two committee amendments, and we recede on the other one, the Creal amendment, because it was unnecessary. We so stated in the report.

Mr. MICHENER. What I am getting at is that the House is presumed to know what the committee of conference has done.

Mr. HOBBS. I will be glad to answer any questions. I have already stated the substance of the report.

Mr. MICHENER. It is very unusual to file a conference report and then ask that it be agreed to without the House being fully advised about it.

Mr. HOBBS. The reading of the statement will give the details. All we do is recede on the Creal amendment, and we do so for the averred and stated reason—and it is unanimous—that the relief sought by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] for certain newspaper editors is already provided in the act.

Mr. MICHENER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two respects and to include in connection therewith certain editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] is recognized for 35 minutes.

#### CONFUSE AND CONQUER

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that, due to an error, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] was given the floor before the time that was allotted to me, because my subject is Confuse and Conquer. Very appropriate, after hearing him trying to "confuse" the American people by quoting from Republican writers. I do hope he shall listen and take heed and pay particular attention to the words of Hitler I shall quote in my speech.

Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in a life-or-death struggle against a deadly and determined enemy.

We must destroy or be destroyed.

We know that now.

We know that the three-headed Fascist monster seeks to be the master folk with all the world as slaves.

We know that the issue for which this war is being fought is freedom or slavery for mankind.

We have been told that this war is different from any ever waged—that it is a global war—that it is total war—that never before in history has destruction been wrought on so terrible a scale.

All this is true. But, the essential characteristic which marks the difference is that never before in history has a conflict required so complete a participation by all the people of the warring nations.

The home front ranks with the battle front and it is for that reason that our every act, our every word, may have a part in victory or defeat.

Our enemy knows the value of the home front and the importance of civilian and national morale.

Hitler said to Herman Rauschning as many as 8 years ago:

We will find men to do our work everywhere. We won't even have to buy them. They'll come looking for us, driven by ambition, by partisan discord, by blindness, by pride, and by hatred. We won't have to use mass attacks by huge armies. What an artillery barrage meant for an infantry advance in trench warfare will be replaced in the future by the psychological dislocation of the enemy by means of revolutionary propaganda.

That is Hitler speaking. Listen and take note. For if we know the enemy's purpose, if we know the enemy's strategy and technique we are better prepared to cope with him and block his attacks.

Well, Hitler's purpose was never any secret.

And, we are all familiar with Hitler's strategy, the plan to divide and conquer.

We are less familiar, perhaps, with his technique, although we are learning more about it every day. He gave us a hint in *Mein Kampf* when he brazenly proclaimed the virtue of a lie, a magnificent lie, the bigger the better, so bold and so monstrous a lie that everyone would believe it to be the truth. He further declared that he would repeat these lies—over and over again—until familiarity could cover the falsehood.

There is another trick in that technique which has been exploited by the Nazis and by their friends, agents, and dupes in this country.

The trick is to "confuse and conquer." I have shown before that Hitler has his men in our midst who, consciously or unconsciously, parallel his propaganda and serve his cause.

I have pointed before to hate-maddened men, with military titles, spewing their poison over the land—venting their spleen for one man against millions.

And let us not forget Eleanor Patterson, the publisher of the *Washington Times-Herald*, the lady with the unladylike language, who is so quick to shout "liar" but so reluctant or unable to disprove the charge she called a lie.

Joseph Patterson, publisher of the *New York Daily News*, and his ex-noble sister,

Eleanor—here in our Capital—are past-masters at the art of confusion and are champion liars, even equaling in that talent the forked tongue of their mentor in Berlin, the infamous Dr. Goebbels.

I consider it my patriotic duty and my sworn pledge to the voters of my district to carry on the fight against the defeatists, the fifth columnists, and the Nazi pawns of America. I consider it my duty to freemen everywhere to pursue this fight to the end.

This is not a personal feud, for neither I nor the Pattersons are private citizens. As a Congressman I am charged with a public trust. As newspaper publishers the Pattersons must serve the public safety. Freedom of the press must not be used to destroy the democracy which grants that freedom.

Nor do I resort to name calling.

When I say Joseph Patterson and Eleanor Patterson are careless with the truth, the phrase is not empty. It is an accusation. I shall prove that charge, just as I have proven the charge that their papers carry Axis propaganda.

I shall also prove that they deliberately spread confusion, and I am certain that they will once more find themselves unable to refute the evidence, for in every instance it will be the evidence of their own pens.

Let us ask the Pattersons a question:

Question. Do you think it possible to avoid a war and build a lasting peace?

Answer. Oh, no; you cannot avoid war because—and I quote from a *New York Daily News* editorial, July 5, 1942:

The people of almost every nation except our own think always and automatically of their own nation's best interests ahead of those of any other nation. This habit will turn up after this war; and, we expect, after all the wars to come.

There are at least five more references to more wars after this on different dates before and after July 5.

But let us take a look at the Pattersons' answer of July 20 to that same question:

Answer. Oh, yes; you can avoid war because—and I quote:

If, when the European war broke out on September 1, 1939, the United States had immediately set itself to building long-range heavy bombers for its own defense, we think those bombers alone would have made this country immune to attack or annoyance in plenty of time to have kept it out of war.

But articles on August 4, May 17, and June 13 all tell us that there will be more wars to come and on June 16 the Patterson team spreads the pure Fascist doctrine, expounded in *Mein Kampf*, that—

Want and fear are two mainsprings of human progress.

Now, want and fear are certainly war breeders, so it seems that Joe Patterson and his sister believe in the inevitability of war.

But do they?

What do these high priests of war say on August 16 about this inevitability?

They say that war can be avoided by compromise. I quote:

But we are not in this war together because we all love one another. We are in it because we are all menaced by the Axis nations; because American, British, Russian,

and Chinese interests around the world directly conflict with German, Japanese, and Italian interests, and no compromise could be worked between them. Or, if it could have been, it wasn't.

They avoid the unavoidable. They believe that armed isolation can keep us out of war, although wars are inevitable.

They hinted on October 4 that our ultimatum to Japan provoked Pearl Harbor. But they told their readers on September 3 that Tojo had always believed in world conquest for Japan and that, had we been wise enough to realize it, his accession to power should have warned us that attack was inevitable.

This is a strange admission for a believer in armed isolation and compromise.

This is a revealing admission for a supposedly alert newsman.

This is a confession that Joseph Patterson and his sister peddle ignorance as well as lies and contradictions to millions of readers daily.

On July 13, we are pleasantly surprised to note the Patterson reaction to the Anglo-Soviet-American accords. Under the title "Pal Joey," the editorial says:

Up to now, Russia has been the one ally that could stand up to Hitler's best and strongest and give them as good as they sent. It has been only common sense all along for us to ship Russia what war gear we could, and for Britain to do the same.

So far, so good. But let us dip a little deeper into that same editorial of July 13, and our fears will be realized, for in an amazing turn about face Patterson follows up the praise for Russia with a typical confuse-and-conquer technique, worthy only of his propaganda minister, Goebbels, by saying:

Pal Joey has always, very shrewdly and realistically, kept promises when it would help him to keep them and broken them when it would help him to break them. . . . If in due time somebody—guess who—has to fight Russia to make Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Finland safe for democracy, we don't expect to be exactly dumfounded.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this statement is one of the most contemptible, deliberately malicious, contradictory, and utterly treacherous attacks upon a great and valiant ally that has been made by a newspaper under the protection of freedom of the press.

And let me also point out that the same sentiment was expressed on the same day via short wave by the propaganda bureaus of Berlin and Rome.

In effect, Patterson tells us in the same breath to give weapons of war to Russia—although warning us that Russia will use those very weapons against us some day.

This is a deliberate attempt to confuse the reader.

Confusion leads to indecision.

The Pattersons are creating confusion and disunity.

The Axis wants us to be confused and disunited.

Remember it was Hitler himself who said that he wouldn't have to buy his

men—that they would play his game through bitterness, stupidity, hatred, and ambition.

The hatred of the Pattersons for President Roosevelt, a hatred which knows no bounds, prompted the treasonable editorial comparing Roosevelt to Caesar—reminding us that Caesar's dictatorship was ended by murder. The analogy is obvious—the intent odious.

But that was not the first time that the Pattersons had called our President a dictator and warmonger.

Nor were they content to stop there.

They sought out Churchill, too, for his share of the Patterson abuse.

On the 19th of July there appeared in the Daily News a cartoon from the poison pen of C. D. Batchelor that is typical of the cowardly, back-stabbing policy of his employer.

The cartoon shows the death-head harpy, World War No. 2, embraced by a man called Politics—a man waving a big cigar—a man who is unmistakably England's Prime Minister.

This man is whispering words of love to the grinning skull, these words:

Honey bunch, I love only you—and me.

Winston Churchill, symbol of the unconquerable British, the man who rallied his country through the dark days of the battle of Britain, becomes in the pages of the Patterson clan a typical dictator who chiselled his way to power during the war that he sought and that he cherishes.

And, just to make a clean sweep, Joseph Patterson hints on August 1 that Stalin is a bloodthirsty monster.

I quote:

Peter the Great, for instance, did more than any other one Russian to westernize, modernize, and improve Russia. Peter was also a bloodthirsty monster in his private life, and we had thought Comrade Joe had come rather to admire Peter in recent years for this or other reasons.

All the warmongers may be found in the camp of the United Nations, according to the Patterson editorials.

But I recall hearing about a man named Hitler.

Didn't he start the war, Joseph Patterson?

The New York Daily News and the Washington Times-Herald say "No." It was the British who started the war—over the Danzig question. At least that was Patterson's opinion in his editorial column August 4.

And that, in the Hitler tradition, is a monstrous lie.

The accusation of war guilt against the enemies of Hitler are deliberate attempts to confuse the public.

But Patterson plays the confuse-and-conquer game to the limit.

After claiming that our leaders are the warmongers in at least a half-dozen editorials—and that is the repeated lie technique—Joseph Patterson contradicts himself on August 30 with a sample of pure lunacy.

He has the madness to tell us that nobody started this war at all—but that Europe decided to commit suicide to relieve the overpopulation. It is almost

unbelievable that any man could advance such an argument.

But I shall quote from that editorial and leave you to judge his sanity or his fitness to be entrusted with the opportunity to influence over 5,000,000 people through his paper and that of his sister. I quote:

Or perhaps Hitler was not wholly to blame for this war. Perhaps there was a subconscious conviction in the minds of many Europeans that there were too many people in Europe anyway and that a big blood-letting might help matters.

This, too, is a monstrous lie.

This, too, is a contradiction of other Patterson contentions of war guilt.

This, too, is a deliberate attempt to "confuse and conquer."

Yet—no Patterson editorial tells the truth.

These are not just isolated incidents which I have presented. My desk is piled high with every issue published in Washington and New York by these people since Pearl Harbor. From this pile of Patterson filth similar lies and contradictions can be selected at random.

Let me briefly put together a paraphrase composite of various Patterson arguments and theories advanced in his editorials during the last few months and note their inconsistencies:

We must make Hawaii impregnable.

Let's concentrate our forces.

We must hold Australia.

Drive the Japs out of the Aleutians.

The best way to win is to have the best generals commanding the troops in the field and the best general is MacArthur.

Let's bring MacArthur home, away from the battlefield.

We must have a second front.

Dieppe proves we cannot have a second front.

I believe in armed isolation.

I believe in balance-of-power imperialism.

We must win the war with our best material so let's drop the draft age to 18 and 19.

But—

To tap a man on the shoulder and tell him he has been drafted to fight for New Guinea is a violation of democracy.

And so on to infinity and to nausea.

The evidence against the Pattersons is now almost complete. I shall confine myself today to presenting only one more exhibit in the case against these seditious newspapers.

On Thursday, October 8, the Patterson papers outdid all their previous efforts to serve the enemy by delivering to their millions of readers an editorial which was prompted, in full, by none other than the Fuehrer, himself.

It was nothing more nor less than a simple rewrite of Hitler's address at the Sportsplatz on September 30, 1942.

We know that the Hitler speech was a propaganda stunt with an important military and political purpose. Hitler, himself, gave the key in the following excerpt from the speech of September 30:

For this year we have prepared for ourselves a very simple program. In the first place, under all circumstances, we must hold whatever must be held. That is to say, we



must let the others attack as much as they wish wherever we have no intention to advance. We must hold everything and must wait to see who tires soonest. In the second place, we must attack under all circumstances where attack is necessary.

Note Hitler's qualification "for this year," Mr. Speaker. Not even sadist Hitler is prepared to promise a defensive strategy in the long run. But there can be no doubt that this year peace in the west fits exactly into Hitler's strategy, so that he can go on attacking, as he says, "where attack is necessary"—namely, Russia.

The matter was put even more plainly by Nazi propagandist, Lord Haw Haw, broadcasting to England and America on October 6. He said, and I quote:

Although the peace has not been made, the war has been won by National Socialist Germany.

Haw Haw, in arguing his statement out, was careful not to mention the military situation in Russia, and the meaning of his talk was clear—we need peace in the west.

Let us now briefly review the facts behind that talk and the aims it sought:

First. The supposedly irresistible German Army had finally met a worthy foe in the indomitable Russians who have been taking daily a tremendous toll of Nazi soldiers.

Second. Hitler was faced with the prospect of another winter campaign and he has not yet forgotten the last one.

Third. He realized the absolute necessity of throwing every last resort against the Russians, of complete concentration on the eastern front.

Fourth. The greatest nightmare of the German high command has always been a land war on two active fronts.

Fifth. Our second-front threat is causing them great concern. This anxiety slipped out when he complained that he is fighting idiots who might attack him anywhere.

Sixth. Therefore, he must find a way to remove that threat or to delay its translation into action.

Seventh. He chose to offer the olive branch, the old, old story we have heard so many times: "I now have all I want. There is no more need for my taking territory."

Let us now turn to that editorial of October 8 called Stalin Can't Quit.

We recall that the New York Daily News and the Washington Times-Herald have constantly warned that Stalin would make a separate peace. This fitted in perfectly with Axis propaganda aims to create mistrust among the Allies.

But, after having heard Hitler's latest speech, these papers suddenly discover that Russia could not possibly sign a separate peace. I quote from their editorial:

The main fact . . . is the fact that Stalin can't quit now. He might even threaten to sign a separate peace with Hitler if the Allies don't open a second front at once; but he can't make good that threat.

The reason why Stalin can't quit is that if he does, he will get back none of the part of Russia now held by the Germans.

Patterson then tells us that Germany will never give up the iron, grain, and

oil territory of Russia, so that—and I quote:

It seems a sure bet that these two mighty enemies will continue to batter each other's brains out around Stalingrad and on less active sectors of their long battle front. The only thing that will get Hitler out of Russia is a complete defeat of Germany.

When it suits his purpose, and, incidentally, it also suits Hitler, Patterson suddenly has no difficulty in proving that he was either a falsifier or an oaf when he warned of a separate Russian peace.

What conclusion does he draw from the fact that Hitler has his hands full in Russia or that only complete defeat of Germany can drive him out?

Does he agree that the answer is to take advantage of Hitler's plight to attack in the west?

No. His answer is that the "western war could stop."

For Hitler is not his enemy. Hitler is his friend. And that was the answer of Hitler.

I quote from the New York Daily News of October 8:

On the other hand, the German-Italian part of the war could be called off in the west had not Great Britain and the United States elected to see it through to the end. . . .

Great Britain could quit now. It was Rudolph Hess' mission in his sensational flight to Scotland to propose that Britain sign a peace with Germany, the British Empire to be left intact. Hitler would no doubt be glad to arrange such a peace now—though, of course, he could not restore to Britain the Empire territories taken by the Japs.

The United States could quit fighting Germany now. Indeed, nothing would please Hitler more. Germany has not taken an inch of our territory and seems unlikely to do so soon.

Mr. Speaker, despite my familiarity with the Pattersons' disloyalty, I am aghast at the utter callousness of these paragraphs.

We, the free United Nations of the world, are locked in mortal combat with the greatest enemy of mankind, and Patterson says that Britain could quit now, that she could make the dream of Hess and Hitler come true, taking care, of course, not to compromise the position of Hitler's ally, Japan.

He claims that we could stop fighting Germany now.

He even admits that nothing would give Hitler greater pleasure.

Realizing the enormity of this criminal argument, Patterson begins part III of the editorial with a weak attempt at covering his tracks. He says, and I quote:

Of course, there is no thought of the Allies' quitting now and leaving Stalin to battle Hitler alone. It is to the Allies' interest to fight on, because their eventual victory now seems almost a mathematical certainty.

After developing the diabolical thesis of peace with Hitler, Patterson, with typical Fascist cynicism, seeks to whitewash himself by saying that there is no thought of the Allies' quitting now and leaving Russia to fight alone.

That is a well-known Nazi device, identical with the old bund trick of opening meetings under the portrait of George Washington, flanked by American flags.

And he stupidly follows up that old chestnut with the devastating claim that our victory is a mathematical certainty.

Any man making such a statement at this time—in the face of all the warnings made by every responsible political and military leader of our Nation—deserves to be put into a cell, one with iron bars or one with padded walls. For such a man is clearly a menace to a free society.

Mr. Speaker, I am addressing myself—not only to the Congress of the United States—I am addressing myself to the residents of Washington, New York, and Chicago to cry out in a great public protest against these traitors in our midst. I am addressing myself to our great and loyal American press to denounce with righteous indignation these disgraceful stains on the record of American journalism.

Patterson's shabby friends of the vermin press have been silenced.

The public outcry must also drown out the Patterson voice of defeat.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Somers of New York.) Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Hill] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, first I want to submit a unanimous-consent request to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a symposium in the Boston Sunday Globe, of September 6, 1942, entitled "Shall Eighteen- and Nineteen-Year-Olds Be Drafted?" by Daniel L. Marsh, president of Boston University. He expresses, to a large extent, my idea on the bill coming up on Saturday except that I do not agree with him with reference to the time. I think instead of 2 years and 4 years it should be very short, 1 or 2 years.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Short], may extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include an article by Frank C. Waldrop.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

#### FOOD AND THE WAR

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune on my recent journey west to spend 10 days in southeastern Washington, the Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. I inspected several Army bases at Yakima, Ephrata, Pasco, and Walla Walla. The men in uniform there are eager to take part in winning a complete victory over the Axis. They are being well trained and the food is both excellent and plentiful. I can personally testify to this as I was invited to mess at both Pasco and Yakima. The officers are efficient and courteous. At Yakima I was conducted by Mr. Frederic G. Lea-

sure, director of the J. M. Perry Institute, through that really fine institution of learning and training. For 2 hours we went from classroom to classroom, from training room to training room to see the young men not only receive the theory of modern aviation construction and warfare but actually putting it into practice in the workroom. The institute is cooperating splendidly with the Federal Government at this place. While we were there 550—the morning shift—were lined up and marched out of the building to be immediately replaced by the afternoon shift of 550. The Perry Institute is a living monument to the wisdom and magnanimity of Mrs. J. M. Perry, who planned and founded this practical school for the youth of the Yakima Valley.

It was my privilege also to spend most of my time out on the farms talking to the workers in the potato patches, the dairy farmers, and wheat farmers on the hills and the small businessmen in their places of activity. To me these people are the ones who have built our fine country up to where it is the most powerful, the most wealthy, and the most democratic country in the world today. Unless we protect and encourage them to continue their activities and maintain their homes, the United States will not continue a worth-while country in which to live. If we permit monopoly and trust companies to own and control our business and agriculture, we are certainly in line for fascism.

The tendency is in that direction today. Let me give you some pertinent instances:

I went out into a potato field near Ellensburg, Wash., and there were 10 or 15 young men and women working there, and 2 of them came to me and said:

We started a dairy last year. We want to stay in the dairy business, but because we cannot hire labor and because of the cost of the feed we have to give to our cows—

And they are paying \$20 a ton for hay—unless the present price of butterfat is continued, we cannot remain in business.

It was a case where they were going out of dairying. I saw a couple up in Badger Pocket, a little distance from Ellensburg. The man is a veteran, a middle-aged man, and they had four or five of the finest Jersey cows I have ever seen, 4 years old. I would say they were worth about \$125 each. They had some heifers, they had some calves and some horses. The local banker had a mortgage of \$700 on these cattle worth about \$1,300 and he was foreclosing the mortgage on November 1, about 2 weeks hence, unless they secured in some way the funds to pay off that mortgage or could get some aid from the Federal Government. They are dairy people and want to continue. He knows the business of dairying, but he has to quit. Another farmer near Ellensburg came to me and said, "Here I have a ranch and a farm hand I hired about 6 months ago." He introduced me to the man and I saw at once he was not really fitted for military service. He had a "bum" leg, as he called it, also a bum knee, and he limped. Yet he received

from his draft board in Iowa a command, if you please, to return to Iowa on Monday, October 12, and report for duty. The farmer said that this man could do the work well, had been doing it for 6 months, that he is a fine hand on the farm, and that he needs him. On the same day I was reading in the papers of the West that our Government was paying for transportation of men in the Middle West to go out into our State and help harvest the crops. Yet they were ordering this man who was disabled to go back, paying his own transportation to go into the Army. As long as that continues the farmers out there are being compelled to go out of business.

I have here a notice of auction sales—"Sale of Jersey herds at auction." There is one auction a day for the next 75 days out there in that county. I talked to the president of the Yakima Dairymen's Association and he said that 25 percent of the dairy cows out there had been sold and most of them for beef. What does that mean? That next year we are threatened with a famine of milk products, of butterfat, of cheese. Twenty-five percent of the dairy cows in my district have been sold, and most of them over the block, and why? Because the farmers cannot get the labor on the farm to run their dairies, to harvest their wheat, to pick their fruit and gather their vegetables. I tell you, my good friends, the situation is critical, and something should be done at once. I have a telegram here from a man and I will read a part of it. It shows the situation. He says that "the present milker is quitting within a week unless I can supply additional help." He also says there is none available. "The only man I know is the one I appealed to you about. Please help." This man, who has a large herd and trucked them from the Yakima Valley over to the coast, is going to lose his dairy business unless he can get help. They are taking his help away from him. The man working for him has some difficulty with his speech, and cannot speak plainly, yet that man is now in the Army. He is a good dairy worker and the dairyman needs him.

I have here something else that I want to refer to, something from the newspapers back there. Here is one heading that says that the dairy herds are going, that there is a labor shortage, that the situation is critical, and the farmer tries desperately to do the tasks of two or three men. That is what they are expecting of the farmers out there, not only to work for themselves, but to do the work of two or three other men.

At Pasco I went to see a dairyman and his wife. They are about 60 years old. The wife was delivering milk every day in the city of Pasco and had been for years. He is threatened with the loss of his dairy. He had about 30 cows. He has a large barn and he said that he could care for 100 cows and would like to do it, but that he had only one laborer on his farm of 160 acres, which a year ago did not show a weed. Now half of it is overgrown with weeds. He said that his man is threatening to leave and work in a de-

fense project. If he does, the dairyman is quitting the dairy business in which he has been engaged for 34 years. Secondly, he tried to get tires for the car that his wife was driving to town to deliver milk to the consumers. They were refused tires on the car. Their tires were worn out. They were refused the tires unless they would use the car to deliver the milk to the storekeepers, and then the consumers of Pasco would have to use their own cars to go down to the store and get the milk.

Here is another statement from the newspapers about a possible acute milk shortage for the Army as well as civilians. It goes on to state that there is an impending milk shortage not only for civilians, but also for the armed forces in this area and Alaska, and quotes Maj. Gen. H. G. Winsor, director of the regional war manpower commission. He says:

There is going to be a critical milk shortage. Dairy cows of this area are being slaughtered at a terrific rate.

I am told by Members of this House that this is going on all over the United States. Where will we buy food next year? If we are not going to allow the farmers of the United States the necessary labor to carry on in producing food and clothes that are just as necessary in the war as are guns and tanks and bombers, where are we going to land? Our soldiers cannot carry guns unless they have food to eat and clothes to wear. Right in my own town of Prosser we had three dairymen. One of them used to deliver milk every morning about 5 o'clock at our home a few years ago. He went out of delivery business about 2 months ago. He sells his milk to another man in the same city. This second man is now quitting. Let me read to you what this man says in an advertisement:

To Our Patrons:

After 12 years we are going out of business because of the price and labor situation.

Our last delivery will be October 14. We thank you for your loyal patronage.

In other words, we had three dairies in the city of Prosser and now there is only one there to furnish milk for the citizens of my home town of Prosser.

Too little is being done right here in Washington, D. C., to save the food situation for next year. I have contended for months that it is just as important to feed and clothe our soldiers and sailors as to manufacture guns, ammunition, tanks, and bombers. Also, we are informed that both England and Russia are calling for food and supplies and equipment, and not men. You have seen that everywhere in the newspapers and elsewhere. They do not need our men. They say so. But they need supplies—food supplies—and yet we are hamstringing the farmers and taking them off of their farms.

Delay will not only lengthen the war, but may jeopardize the victory that we are all fighting and sacrificing for.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] several weeks ago sensed the critical condition in his great State of Iowa



and contacted officials here in Washington, D. C., on the matter. He also contacted the War Manpower Commission both in his State and here in the capital, and they are quite sympathetic to his proposition of having "at least one able-bodied man left on every farm and that dairy farms must be given special consideration because dairy products are the most urgently needed of all foods."

Here, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Council Bluffs Nonpareil, showing the necessity of having these farmers kept on the farms.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SOMERS of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

#### DRAFTING FARMERS

Secretary of Agriculture Wickard said the other day that he had made it plain to General Hershey that at least one able-bodied man must be left on every farm and that dairy farms must be given special consideration, because dairy products are the most urgently needed of all foods.

We hope for the good of the country and for the success of the war program that Mr. Wickard is able to make his demands stick. There are reports from many areas that draft boards are not following this policy. We do not personally know of any farm operators who have been taken, but we have heard of instances where the only able-bodied man about the place has been drafted, or expects to be, in the very near future.

The dwindling farm-labor supply is unquestionably the biggest threat to United States food production in 1943.

"There is a question in my mind whether American farmers can increase production or even maintain this year's level under the handicap of growing labor shortages," Secretary Wickard told an Illinois audience a few days ago.

"I know they will keep on trying," he continued, "but I am not sure they can overcome all the obstacles in their way. This year's shortage of farm labor is nothing to what they will encounter in the future. With our Army growing at the present rate and with war factories expanding in order to support our growing forces, the drain upon agricultural manpower will become more and more serious."

This raises the question as to the ultimate size of our Army. That it will be an increasingly controversial issue is inevitable. War Department officials and generals are now talking about an army of 10,000,000 to 13,000,000 men. It is doubtful if our farms and factories can keep such an army supplied and at the same time supply our Allies with the needed food, equipment, and supplies.

We have before us the experience of England, which drafted too many miners. The country's coal production was reduced so much that factories had to shut down and many people came near freezing.

We cannot afford to make such a mistake here. Congress ought to look into the whole matter before the country's production of food and war equipment is demoralized.

Mr. HILL of Washington. It is not only the dairy farmer, but also the wheat farmer. I have some old friends who have lived up on Rattlesnake Hills near Prosser for 50 years. Both of them are old. Both of them are ill. They have one son. Now this next month he is called to the colors. That is fine. We are not saying anything against that under nor-

mal conditions. We are not saying anything about calling men to the colors to fight, but when he goes those two old people cannot function. They cannot carry on the work on the farm, and that farm is going to lie idle. Several hundred acres that have been raising wheat for the last 30 or 40 years will be idle for the next year or the next 2 or 3 years. My contention is that we need some of these men on the farms to produce food, not only for our soldiers and sailors, but to feed Europe and our Allies.

Not only have the small farmers been crowded to the wall and off the farms, but small business is being driven off from the streets of our towns and cities. That is just as critical and serious. I talked to a furniture dealer in Yakima and he showed me a magazine article where three small furniture dealers had gone out of business this last month. He said, "We cannot get supplies. Of course, then we cannot sell." He said, "Within 6 months we will go out of business." There is a threat in this country to the small businessman and to the small farmer.

I have a letter here from a businessman in College Place saying the same thing. He will have to go out of business. They are going out of business by the tens of thousands all over the Nation. It is serious. It is critical. It is just as important to the winning of this war that we keep men on the farms as it is that we produce guns and ammunition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. May I conclude by saying that the small, individual businessman and farmer have made this country great. It is democracy in action. It is what our men are fighting for all over the world and on the seven seas today. We must preserve this independence and progress here at home while our boys are fighting for it abroad. It is our common heritage to enjoy, it is our common duty to preserve, it is our common privilege to promote and maintain.

I appeal not only to the Members of Congress, but I appeal to the administration and to those in authority in the United States, in Washington, D. C., to consider this critical situation, to help keep our men on the farms and in industry, and to save the small businessmen and small farmers throughout the United States from the ruin that awaits them unless drastic steps are immediately taken.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS], be granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address by Louis Nizer on The Right to Fight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, cheaply, easily, for more than a hundred years, America spread civilization through the world by letting other nations copy our successful pattern. Today, unfortunately, those who operate our Republic now seem to feel smarter than the men who invented it. It is our hard luck that we have Government chauffeurs so daring they cut a new road as they go along instead of following the trail from which generations of successful drivers feared to detour.

For more than 100 years American statesmen protected freedom of the press. Often Government leaders must have struggled with themselves to resist the temptation to use Government power to intimidate newspapers that reviled them. Apparently they resisted the temptation. Our Congress today resists it. Certain newspapers recently in a so-called purge have defamed some of our most valuable Members of Congress. But those Members of Congress who were themselves burned at the stake endure the ordeal without so much as whispering that such newspapers should be suppressed or threatened by Government.

It seems, however, that some administrators want to find out what will happen to America if they try running it with a frightened press. Not long ago your Government filed a criminal charge against writers of one of our popular midwestern newspapers, the Chicago Tribune. A grand jury dismissed the charge. Now a few weeks later one hears that Government has filed suit on some technical charge against an association of many American newspapers, called the Associated Press.

A wise government, like a wise mother, whips seldom. The merits of the case are not yet decided. Whatever the decision, real damage to the freedom of the press has already been done by government.

This new experiment is full of significance for every thinking citizen. Today of all days, to be sure, every American citizen is, or should be, a thinking citizen, alert to preserve whatever principles of government have, in the past, made this Nation a great nation.

There is, I suppose, no one newspaper with which you can thoroughly agree, so long as each one remains independent. One newspaper may approach news from the point of view of the industrial worker. Another may sound like the voice of a financier. Another wants to take an impersonal view of the news, but being written by human beings, is probably also a little prejudiced. A few may have no other object than to spread false propaganda.

Does it hurt you to have all this variety of opinion and news circulating through your country? You read certain newspapers, your neighbors prefer others.

You argue among yourselves. You stimulate one another to accept, reject, discriminate, and think for yourselves. Your mind and the garden of minds that make up America flourish in this fertile soil which is enriched rather than ruined by a certain amount of trash.

You know that illogical opinions soon become smothered by better; that newspapers which go too far soon lose their readers and fall of their own weight. Maybe today you approve the way Government is doing things and would like to see anybody who criticizes the administration driven out of business. Tomorrow you may wish to goodness some newspaper dared to print Government mistakes you have noticed which waste lives and resources.

You want to keep this a country which encourages everybody to think and express his ideas. You would rather read a few lies, even about yourself and all you hold dear, than risk frightening all newspapers into sounding one point of view like the printed megaphones in Hitler's Reich. You think maybe you had better not let this country become one like broken France or Belgium where nobody prints what the Government does not want except a few brave editors printing in secret basements living every minute in terror of being discovered and punished by Government.

You do not want newspapers to be corrupted by money or intimidated by gangsters. You know that government today, with billions in its pockets, with war powers and courts where decisions are made by judges appointed by government, has an almost irresistible power to corrupt, to intimidate. It can even intimidate without intending to intimidate. What citizen, what editor thinks his views so important that he wants to risk a prison sentence in order to express them?

Repress free speech, repress the press, and how much good will the right to vote do you? About as much good, you may decide, as the vote in Hitler's Reich.

You believe that America can be converted into complete dictatorship for the duration of the war and, because of American character and resources, still beat Hitler. So do I. But why try to do it gagged and blindfolded like the poor dupes in Hitler's Reich? Why not try to win the war the same way Americans, for more than 100 years, won wars and licked depressions? With every American inventing ideas and not afraid to express them. With America hitting on all 130,000,000 mental cylinders. You already know that road leads to victory.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SHEPPARD, for 15 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HAINES, for Friday, October 16, on account of important business.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5143. An act to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 16, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1969. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy of the legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John of Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1970. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the President to confer decorations and medals upon units of, or persons serving with, the military forces of cobelligerent nations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1971. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to accord free entry to bona fide gifts from members of armed forces of the United States on duty abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1972. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a complete set of all of laws passed by the Municipal Councils and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands during the fiscal year 1942; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1973. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a list of laws enacted by the municipal councils in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7491. A bill to provide for the granting of rights-of-way for pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products and for telephone and/or telegraph lines along and across parkway lands in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 7573. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Director of Procurement to acquire motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles necessary for the successful prosecution of the present war; without amendment (Rept. No. 2570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 553. Resolution for the consideration of S. 1481, a bill to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal; without amendment (Rept. No. 2571). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7424. A bill to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7528. A bill to amend the Selective

Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability; with amendments (Rept. No. 2574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 7711. A bill providing for taxation for bonded indebtedness by the States and their political subdivisions of real property acquired by or on behalf of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 7712. A bill to provide relief for victims of the flood of September 17, 1942, in and near the village of Spring Valley, Wis.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 7713. A bill to promote the prosecution of the war by preventing monopolistic practices with regard to patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7714. A bill for the relief of Brooklyn Iron Works, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 7715. A bill for the relief of the Young Men's Christian Association of Columbia, S. C., the Young Women's Christian Association of Columbia, S. C., the Richland County Post, No. 6, of the American Legion, of Columbia, S. C., and C. J. Nairn; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3366. By Mr. HAINES: Petition signed by members of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, No. 1599, of Chambersburg, Pa., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 860 or any other prohibition legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3367. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. J. E. Mattison and 58 other citizens of Jewett, Tex., favoring legislation to prohibit the sale of liquor at the soldier training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3368. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Hillcrest Park Property Owners Association, Inc., Queens County, N. Y., voicing its disapproval of the threatened danger to the health of their community and the consequent sufferings due to the fuel-oil situation as it relates to the individual home owner; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3369. Also, resolution of the first zone, First Assembly District Regular Democratic Club of Long Island City, N. Y., protesting against the proposed closing of the National Sugar Refining Co. plant in Long Island City, N. Y., which would result in a lay-off of some 1,500 people and only add to the great number of unemployed in the city of New York; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3370. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the California State Federation of Labor, at its forty-third annual convention, supporting Senate bill 2329, compensation for captured Wake Island construction workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3371. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. J. T. Steele and 475 other citizens of Webb City



and Jasper County, Mo., petitioning for legislation to stop liquor and vice exploitation of our men in defense service and such other legislation as will protect homes from being invaded with liquor advertisements over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3372. Also, petition of Joseph V. Pitts and sundry citizens of Ava and Douglas County, Mo., petitioning that a ban be put on intoxicating liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, how priceless is the gift of life and how close we are to the source of strength. Nothing from Thee is too difficult for us to attempt and nothing too grievous for us to bear. Strong must be the soul that does not faint under the strain of these days, do Thou invigorate our hearts and weapon our minds. Almighty God, this is Thy world, full of riches and full of Thy glory; keep us in grateful remembrance that life is broadened and deepened, dignified, and worth living by the things we lay hold of by faith. Thou dost call us to a life of devotion and patriarchal prayer and a reverent walk with our Heavenly Father on earth.

It matters little how rudely the winds of cruel fate may jar and shake, if the very fiber of our being is of real virtue and goodness; they heal, redeem, and satisfy, for Christ is the true vine and the immortal soul is the unwithering branch. This world, groaning under the weight of crimes and follies is in the hands of a good God, yet the vastness of evil, the exceeding frailty at the moment of our keenest trials, these disturb and defeat. O do Thou increase our faith in Saint Mary's Holy Child and inspire us with the eternal motives which swayed the teaching of our Blessed Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2794. An act to provide for adjusting royalties for the use of inventions for the benefit of the United States, in aid of the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's desk and after any

special orders previously arranged, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]?

There was no objection.

### PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON H. R. 7528

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have the privilege of filing a report and rule on H. R. 7528 by midnight tonight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what bill is that?

Mr. SABATH. That is H. R. 7528.

Mr. RICH. We cannot keep these numbers in mind. What does it provide?

Mr. SABATH. That is the Wadsworth bill. It is an amendment to the draft law.

Mr. RICH. Drafting boys 18 and 19 years old?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; that is a part of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement by Westbrook Pegler.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS]?

There was no objection.

### WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS GRADE AND PAY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2751) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States," approved May 14, 1942, to create the grade of field director in such corps, to provide for enrolled grades in such corps comparable to the enlisted grades in the Regular Army, to provide pay and allowances for all members of such corps at the same rates as those payable to members of the Regular Army in corresponding grades, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2751) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States," approved May 14, 1942, to create the grade of field director in such corps, to provide for enrolled grades in such corps comparable to the enlisted grades in the Regular Army, to provide pay and allowances for all members of such corps at the same rates as those payable to members of the Regular Army in corresponding grades, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

A. J. MAY,  
R. E. THOMASON,  
W. G. ANDREWS,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

ROBT. R. REYNOLDS,  
ELBERT D. THOMAS,  
ED C. JOHNSON,  
WARREN R. AUSTIN,  
CHAN GURNEY,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2751) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States," approved May 14, 1942, to create the grade of field director in such corps, to provide for enrolled grades in such corps comparable to the enlisted grades in the Regular Army, to provide pay and allowances for all members of such corps at the same rates as those payable to members of the Regular Army in corresponding grades, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill provided that the pay and allowance rates applicable to the grades of director and assistant director in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps should be increased to rates comparable to those of colonels and lieutenant colonels, respectively, in the Regular Army. It authorized the creation of the new grade of field director and provided that persons appointed to such grade should receive pay and allowances comparable to those received by majors in the Regular Army, and increased the pay and allowance rates for first, second, and third officers to rates comparable to those applicable to captains, first lieutenants, and second lieutenants, respectively, in the Regular Army.

The House amendment reduces to their present levels the pay and allowance rates for the grades of director and assistant director, and reduces the rate for the new grade of field director to correspond with that of a first lieutenant in the Regular Army. It retains the provisions of the Senate bill, however, with respect to rates of pay for first, second, and third officers.

The effect of the House amendment would be that persons in the grades of assistant director or field director would receive pay and allowances at the same or lower rates than many of their subordinates. The conference agreement restores the pay and allowance provisions with respect to the director, assistant directors, and field directors, which were contained in the Senate bill.

A. J. MAY,  
R. E. THOMASON,  
L. C. ARENDS,  
FOREST A. HARNES,

*Managers on the part of the House.*